

Soviet Union SUPPLEMENT National Affairs

FBIS-SOV-91-008-S

CONTENTS

11 January 1991

NOTICE TO READERS: As of 2 January 1991, television sourcelines in the DAILY REPORT will reflect how a station identifies itself. In most cases, this change eliminates the "Television Service" designation in favor of the station identification as broadcast. The presence of a new television sourceline reflects this change in policy, rather than the establishment of a new station or network.

NOTICE TO READERS: An * indicates material not disseminated in electronic form.

NATIONAL AFFAIRS

Political & Social

Paper Reports CPSU Commission Sessions [PRAVDA 10 Dec]	1
CPSU Secretariat Discusses Youth Policy [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 9 Dec]	1
CPSU Socioeconomic Commission Meets 4 Dec [PRAVDA 5 Dec]	3
CPSU Rules on Budget Published [PRAVDA 17 Dec]	5
Commission Examines CPSU Privilege Abuses [PRAVDA 16 Dec]	7
Ivashko Chairs Party Economic Discussion [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Dec]	11
Ivashko Meets With Social Sciences Academy [PRAVDA 8 Dec]	11
PRAVDA Roundtable Debates Union Treaty [PRAVDA 10 Dec]	12
Debate at Managers' Conference Summarized [PRAVDA 7 Dec]	16
Political Movements Discuss Union Treaty [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]	17
Parties Disagree on Treaty [TASS]	17
Official Interviewed on Parties' Registration [IZVESTIYA 3 Jan]	18
'Marxist Platform' To Hold Conference 26-27 Jan [PRAVDA]	18
Free Labor Party Forms; Supports 'Businessmen' [Moscow International]	19
Congress of Labor Collectives Union Opens [Moscow TV]	19
Union Program Reported [IZVESTIYA 12 Dec]	19
Turkish Paper Interviews KGB Official [Istanbul MILLIYET]	20
Second Installment [27 Nov]	20
Final Installment [28 Nov]	21
Petrovskiy, UN Environment Official Hold Talks [TASS]	22
Gorbachev Congratulates Medical Academy [PRAVDA 14 Dec]	23
Two Soviet Intelligence Agents Receive Award [Moscow International]	23
Leaders Sign Former Abkhaz CP Chief's Obituary [PRAVDA 19 Dec]	23
Figures for Various Parties' Membership Given [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 13 Dec]	24
Unemployment Problems, Solutions Pondered [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 5 Jan]	24
Aviation Official Outlines Aeroflot Plans [TASS]	26
Health Collegium Discusses Plague Prevention [IZVESTIYA 4 Dec]	26
MVD Briefing Stresses Militia Shortage [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 19 Dec]	27
Azerbaijani Hijacker Arrested in Tbilisi [Baku Radio]	27
1976-1990 Attempted Hijackings Examined [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Dec]	28
Oversight Committee Outlaws Secret Enactments [IZVESTIYA 1 Dec]	30
Press Briefing on Chernobyl Clean-up [TASS]	30
Consequences of Chernobyl Accident Reviewed [Moscow International]	31
Chernobyl Victims in Tula Receive CPSU Funds [PRAVDA 5 Jan]	31
Turnout Low at Omsk Anti-Gorbachev Rally [RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA 7 Dec]	31
Moscow Rally Marks Human Rights Day [TASS]	32
'Soapbox Democracy' of Manezh Rally Hit [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 11 Dec]	32
Penalties Facing Unregistered Papers Detailed [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Jan]	33
Journalists' Saturday 'Antistrike' Reported [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 8 Jan]	33
KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA States Principles [1 Jan]	34

PRAVDA Reports on Subscriptions, Sunday Issues	35
Distribution Discrimination Claimed [8 Dec]	35
Views Sunday Issues, Supplements [9 Jan]	36
Issues Appeal for Readers [19 Dec]	36
SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on Publishing Problems	36
Views Sunday Nonpublication [8 Jan]	36
Sees Distributor's 'Discrimination' [8 Dec]	37
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Subscription Campaign Results [4 Dec]	38
To Drop Sunday Edition [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 5 Dec]	39
Paper on Publication Changes [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 8 Dec]	39
Rival Publications Dispute Title GLASNOST [IZVESTIYA 18 Dec]	40
Gosteleradio Pressure on TV Shows Scored [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 51]	40
TV Announcer Accused of Distorting Facts [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 18 Dec]	41
KGB Man's Problems with 'Vzglyad' Reported [Moscow TV]	41
Radio Rossiya News Chief Interviewed [Moscow Radio]	43
Paper Lists Schedules for 'Radio Rossiya' [KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 9 Dec]	43
Volgograd TV To Show Deutsche Welle Programs [IZVESTIYA 20 Dec]	43
Stations To Produce Pro-Army Programs [Moscow Radio]	43
Zalygin Challenges Literary Paper's Claim [LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA No 48]	44
Court Case Over Journal ZNAMYA Described [LITERATURNAYA GAZETA No 51]	46
First Edition of New Paper Appears in Moscow [Moscow Radio]	47
New Newspaper Started in Leningrad [Moscow Radio]	47
New Leningrad, Moscow Papers Published [Moscow Radio]	47
New Intellectual Weekly Published [Moscow International]	47
400 Publishing Houses in Operation [Moscow TV]	47
Altay Kray, Soviets Dispute Over Newspaper [IZVESTIYA 12 Dec]	48

Economic

Incomplete Construction Projects' Sale Proposed [IZVESTIYA 8 Jan]	48
Manager Warns of Serious Supply Shortfalls [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 4 Jan]	49
Foreign Travel Expected To 'Drop Sharply' [IZVESTIYA 9 Jan]	50
Food Combines Must Share Blame for Blocked Shipments [IZVESTIYA 18 Dec]	51
Russian City Developing Commodity Market [SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA 8 Jan]	51
Publisher Transfers to Joint Stock Company [TASS]	51
Menatep Bank Sells Investment Shares to Public [TASS]	52
Joint Venture Showroom Opens in Moscow [PRAVDA 23 Dec]	52
Consumer, Defense Plants Urged To Share Expertise [Moscow TV]	52

Military

Reform of Disaster Rescue Arrangements Urged [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 10 Jan]	53
Political Columnist Reacts to Yazov Broadcast [TRUD 30 Nov]	54
Military Reform Issue Raised by Rear Services [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 15 Dec]	55
Youth Armed Forces Propaganda Association Formed [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Dec]	55
Military Academy Holds Humanitarian Law Seminar [Radio Rossiya]	55
General Interviewed on Seminar [Moscow TV]	55
Chekov Remarks on Returning Troops' Housing [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 2 Dec]	56
Draft on Reforming Political Organs Approved [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 23 Nov]	57
Moscow Meeting Marks Rocket Forces Day [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 Nov]	58
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Carries Generals' Obituaries	58
Retired Colonel General [15 Dec]	58
Leading DOSAAF Official [18 Nov]	58
Academy Lecturer [27 Nov]	58
Feature Honors Posthumous Hero of Soviet Union [KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 17 Nov]	59
KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Airs Nuclear Test Issues [10 Nov]	59
Military Officials Uphold Yugoslav Proposal [Belgrade TANJUG]	61

Political & Social

Paper Reports CPSU Commission Sessions

PM1212151590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Dec 90 Second Edition p 3

[Unattributed report: "Joint Session: At CPSU Central Committee Standing Commissions"]

[Text] A joint session of the CPSU Central Committee standing commissions on the renewal of the activity of primary party organizations and sociopolitical affairs was held 8 December.

The commissions heard a report from Yu.A. Manayenkov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, on preparatory work in the registration of the CPSU Statutes at the USSR Justice Ministry. It was noted that the new party Statutes adopted at the 28th CPSU Congress basically correspond to the requirements of the USSR Law "On Public Associations" and must be presented for registration by the prescribed date. During the discussion of this question members of the standing commissions reached the unanimous opinion that the registration of the party Statutes is not a simple formal act but an important political landmark in the party's life.

The standing commissions' members keenly discussed CPSU Central Committee Secretary V.A. Kuptsov's report on improving the work of Communists who are USSR people's deputies in the supreme organ of state power. Special attention was paid here to increasing Communists' activeness in legislative work and in establishing their cooperation with representatives of other sociopolitical organizations and movements in the interests of consolidating society and normalizing the socioeconomic and political situation in the country. The commissions made recommendations to party committees on stepping up party political work in the approaching Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies.

The commissions examined the reworked draft provisions on the status of the primary party organization secretary and instructions on registering members' party dues and the financial and economic activity of party organizations and on the work of party organizations in the USSR Armed Forces.

Reports on those questions were delivered by P.M. Melnikov, party committee secretary at the "Karagandaugol" Association's mine named for the 50th anniversary of the October Revolution, N.Ye. Kruchina, administrator of affairs of the CPSU Central Committee, and N.N. Dmukha, secretary of a military unit party committee.

The commission members on the whole supported the draft normative methodological documents that were submitted. At the same time they expressed a number of ideas on the social protection of party organization

secretaries, the priority right of primary party organizations in the formation of the party budget, and the acceleration of the processes of the creation of new party structures in the Armed Forces. The commissions instructed working groups to finalize the preparation of the draft documents in the light of the discussion held and submit them for examination at a joint plenum of the CPSU Central Committee and the Central Control Commission.

The session also discussed the nominations for advisers to CPSU Central Committee commissions and adopted a decision recommending that the CPSU Central Committee plenum confirm them.

USSR people's deputies and leaders of the USSR Supreme Soviet communist deputies' group took part in the commissions' work.

The session was chaired by O.S. Shenin, member of the Politburo and secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

On the same day there was a session of the CPSU Central Committee commission on science, education, and culture, chaired by I.T. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo.

A detailed report on the session will be published later.

CPSU Secretariat Discusses Youth Policy

91US0149A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 9 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[PRAVDA-TASS report: "Who Will the Youth Be With? From the Session of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat"]

[Text] In his opening remarks to the Secretariat session, V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, presented a detailed evaluation of last week's events, and of the socio-economic and sociopolitical situation in the country.

On the eve of the Secretariat session V.A. Ivashko met with secretaries in charge of socio-economic policy in the Central Committees of the Union republic Communist Parties; prior to that he had met with a large group of secretaries of the primary organizations. The fiscal year, as well as the current five-year period, is almost over. There is no new five-year plan; this situation is so unusual for tens of thousands of industrial enterprise administrators raised in the tradition of the planned economy, that it causes consternation and even certain confusion. Qualitatively new approaches are needed, as well as business acumen, entrepreneurship, and aggressiveness. So far, with the exception of the defense complex, signed production and delivery contracts cover only 49 percent of declared demand.

V.A. Ivashko noted that session participants had emphasized the need to sign the Union treaty as soon as possible. The disintegration of the Union would also

mean the disintegration of established economic links and anarchy in production. The way out of the socio-economic crisis lies, first of all, in reinforcing the integrity of the renewed Union. This idea was also brought forward at the regional conference of secretaries of primary party organizations in the city of Obninsk, Kaluga Oblast, and at the meeting of the permanent Socio-Economic Commission of the CPSU Central Committee. It is also supported by thousands of letters and telegrams being received by the CPSU Central Committee.

Among other factors, the political situation in the country is determined to a large degree by the social mood of the youth. The position of the youth will greatly influence both the fate of the socialist society, and the fate of the CPSU. The political struggle will be won by those who sway youth to their side. As is known, the 28th CPSU Congress has adopted a special resolution on policy towards youth, and has delineated its priority directions.

The recently created CPSU Central Committee Commission on Youth Policy presented to the Central Committee Secretariat with its proposals on how to fulfill the congress resolutions. Commission Chairman I.I. Melnikov, who is also a member of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat and a member of the party committee of the Moscow State University imeni M.V. Lomonosov, has briefly outlined the proposed action program. In his opinion, it is directed at the creation of realistic conditions and incentives for young people to fulfill their life goals and at their inclusion into active political and socio-economic activity.

In particular, the commission intends to propose several all-Union programs, such as: Employment of youth and its preparation for entry into the labor market; social rehabilitation of young invalids; increased production of goods and services for children and young people; construction of housing that takes the needs of youth into account; support for young families; the search for and development of young talent; and growth in youth entrepreneurship. The commission also plans to actively participate in creating new entities on youth problems within legislative and executive power organs, in defining their functions and the contents of their activities, and in finding personnel to carry out the work of these entities.

The commission will work towards creating a state and public system of social security for young people, to ensure its social guarantees during the period of transition to the market economy. It will also protect the youth's spiritual interests: Under the conditions of the market economy, it will work out and propose to the USSR Supreme Soviet and the USSR Government a number of proposals, particularly regarding the publication of literature, newspapers, and magazines aimed at children and teenagers.

To realize these plans, all-out informal support and help are needed. I.I. Melnikov asked the CPSU Central Committee apparatus to create units to be in charge of youth policy issues.

This proposal has been supported by CPSU Central Committee Secretary A.S. Dzasokhov. The youth commission should have its own "calling card" in the structure of the CPSU Central Committee apparatus, he said. Many countries have ministries or committees on youth affairs. Perhaps, a new position of presidential assistant on youth affairs should be created. There could be a wide variety of approaches. What matters is not the form, but the substance. And the substance urgently demands accelerated development and practical implementation of an effective, integrated policy on the part of the party towards the young generation.

The Central Committee secretary emphasized that the CPSU's relationship with the youth should be based on full trust of the youth, respect for their right to independent political activities, and abandonment of the policy of interfering in youth affairs. He has recently had several meetings, both at the center and locally, including a number of meetings with members of the bureau and secretaries of the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] Central Committee. He believes that the time is ripe for a joint plenum of the CPSU and VLKSM Central Committees. Local party and Komsomol [Leninist Communist Youth League] committees also could hold such joint plenums. This would be a wonderful opportunity to discuss, on an equal footing, the problems of youth in the current changing conditions!

What is the VLKSM today? Komsomol congresses have taken place in 12 republics, new names have been adopted, and the organizations themselves have changed, said V.M. Zyukin, first secretary of the VLKSM Central Committee and member of the CPSU Central Committee. He supported the idea of a plenum, at which time, in his opinion, it should be clearly determined what kind of youth organization the CPSU may view as its main supporter, and create favorable conditions to have, in return, a supply of fresh reinforcements for the party ranks.

The speaker then elaborated several other specific points of the program under discussion. He put forward a number of comments and suggestions. He indicated that the problems causing him particular concern were the survival of young families under the conditions of market relations, the prospects of publications for the youth and children, and the CPSU position on the issue of developing a children's movement.

A.Ya. Degtyarev, member of the CPSU Central Committee and first deputy chief of the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department, believes that the proposed action program requires additional work. While supporting the commission's plan as a whole, he drew attention to its many vulnerable points, especially

in the part that deals with social, economic, and legal mechanisms for implementing the proposed plan. The Central Committee member emphasized that these mechanisms must be effective, reliable, and strong. The draft document requires substantial additional work; it must define the core, and could become a focal point for the efforts of the state organs and of public organizations.

CPSU Central Committee Secretary Yu.A. Manayenkov offered a number of critical comments on the draft document. It is important, he emphasized, for the youth policy to be developed not only in the center, but locally as well. This work should be done on all levels, including in village and settlement soviets; it is also necessary to take greater account of regional and national specifics.

Summarizing the results of this discussion of the issue, B.A. Ivashko suggested that the draft needs to be revised in order to incorporate the proffered opinions and suggestions. He emphasized that tangible help from the party for the youth is the precondition for the rejuvenation of our public and state life. The youth will only follow that party whose policy it finds attractive. The party committees should expand their dialog with the young people, they should cooperate with all those youth organizations and movements that stand on positions of socialist choice and orient themselves towards the consolidation of social forces. It is also important that Komsomol and other youth organizations not be saddled with state duties for the coming generation, as has been the case before—these duties should be fulfilled by the state and by the entire society, including the party.

The session of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat also discussed issues related to the upcoming CPSU Central Committee plenum. Among those who participated in the discussion were CPSU Central Committee Secretaries A.S. Dzasokhov, Yu.A. Manaenkov, Ye.S. Strove, V.M. Falin, and O.S. Shenin, and member of the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat I.I. Melnikov.

CPSU Socioeconomic Commission Meets 4 Dec

*PM1312155590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Dec 90 Second Edition pp 1-2*

[TASS report: "Main Area of Party Policy. Session of CPSU Central Committee Standing Socioeconomic Commission"]

[Text] The immediate prospects for the development of the country's national economy and, as a consequence, the priority tasks for realizing the party's socioeconomic policy during the transition to the market were examined at a session of the CPSU Central Committee Standing Socioeconomic Commission. It was held 4 December under the chairmanship of V.A. Ivashko, member of the Politburo and deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee.

The concepts of the country's draft plan and budget for 1991 were discussed in detail with due regard for the

decisions of the 28th party congress and the CPSU Central Committee October (1990) Plenum.

Reports on the special features of the said documents and on the progress of their examination by the country's Supreme Soviet were delivered by L.B. Vid, first deputy chairman of the USSR State Planning Committee, and V.A. Rayevskiy, USSR deputy minister of finance. Participating in the discussion were V.V. Gerashchenko, chairman of the Board of the USSR State Bank; Yu.N. Pakhomov, secretary academician of the Economic Department of the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic Academy of Sciences; V.S. Markaryants, USSR first deputy minister of the medical industry; O.D. Potreki, secretary of the Latvian Communist Party Central Committee; S.V. Kolpakov, USSR minister of metallurgy; A.P. Litovchenko, first secretary of Chelyabinsk Obkom [oblast party committee]; A.P. Nekhayevskiy, first secretary of Vinnitsa Ukrainian Communist Party Obkom; K.A. Nikolayev, bulldozer driver of the No. 3 "Mosstroyemkhanizatsiya" Trust; A.G. Melnikov, secretary of the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic Communist Party Central Committee; and V.S. Malkovskiy, secretary of the Estonian Communist Party Central Committee.

The commission's analysis and interpretation of problems went far beyond the plan-forecast guidelines for 1991. They were examined as part and parcel of the current sociopolitical situation in the country.

It was pointed out at the session that in terms of their thrust, established priorities, and financial and resource balances the draft forecast guidelines for the functioning of the national economy may be regarded as definite preconditions for stabilizing and balancing the economy, enhancing its receptivity to the consistent commissioning of market mechanisms, and preventing a fall in Soviet people's living standards. The said approaches to shaping the plan-forecast development of the country's national economy were approved in principle by practically all the session participants.

At the same time note was taken of the existence of a package of questions, without resolving which it will hardly be possible to stabilize the situation in the economy. It is a question, above all, of a linkage between the various sections of the plan and areas of development of the national economy and the social sphere. This concerns, in particular, the conformity of the plans for the production of output, particularly consumer goods, and the capital construction programs with the potential for supplying them with material and technical resources, balance between the population's monetary income and expenditure, and the reliability of the sources for forming the union budget. Many people drew attention to the fact that the material flow and the financial flow in the projected version of the development of social production do not conform to each other. And here it is impossible to agree fully with the government's position that the plan for 1991 should not be viewed in the old way of understanding it, in other words

as a document administratively defining practically all the proportions of economic development. The hopes only of an all-Union forecast containing statewide information for all levels of management are unjustified, particularly if you take account of the critical state of society. All the more so as this forecast has been drawn up for just one year.

Note was taken of the inadequate depth of study of the most important economic proportions of the forecast national economic development next year and the reality of a sharp redistribution of GNP resources in favor of current consumption. It is important to make a more concrete analysis of the consequences of a sharp fall in the proportion of national income used for expanded reproduction. This particularly concerns the further reduction—enshrined in the draft plan—of capital investments in the basic sectors and primarily in the fuel and energy complex. In addition to reducing the pace of economic development and the reliability of the country's energy supply, this could lead to serious complications in the foreign economic balance.

Great attention was devoted to a very important area of stabilizing the economy—the formation and utilization of financial resources. There is still a mass of unresolved problems here. The chief of them is linked with the lack of unity in implementing a concerted financial, tax, and budget policy in the Union as a whole and within individual republics. The successful resolution of this task largely depends on the political state of the country, and the CPSU has a possibility here and is called upon to make a weighty constructive contribution by consolidating with progressive sociopolitical trends and taking an uncompromising stand with regard to destructive forces.

As world experience shows, the transition to a new quality of the country's economic growth is only possible if there is efficient scientific and technical activity. Speaking about this truly inexhaustible source of economic progress, the members of the CPSU Central Committee commission pointed to its manifest underestimation in the 1991 draft plan. It does not yet seem realistic to reckon that the new economic milieu that is being created will automatically resolve all problems and, above all, the task of production's receptivity to scientific and technical achievements. The idea that it is necessary to subject to additional critical analysis the volumes and scope of centralized funding of the most important areas of scientific and technical progress was aired convincingly. This concerns, above all, the long-term studies being carried out at the interface between basic and applied research.

Particular anxiety is occasioned by the highly simplified approach to resolving problems of employment for working people and by the lack of an in-depth analysis of the specific situation in the labor market, of a forecast of it for next year, or of an assessment of the real scale of possible unemployment and its sociopolitical consequences. The supposition was made that it is necessary

to make a special examination of this question in the very near future and to draw up corresponding proposals. The CPSU Central Committee Socioeconomic Policy Department was entrusted with studying this very acute problem and preparing the necessary analytical materials.

At the session great attention was devoted to the practical realization of the outlined plans. In the opinion of many participants in the discussion, the first thing that has to be done in the present situation is to restore the necessary flows of technical industrial output and consumer goods, including food, in the country.

The second condition for successfully realizing the outlined plans is control over the mass of money in circulation. The task consists in seeking all available ways and means of reducing budget expenditure, ensuring preferential growth in production of consumer goods, and balancing them with the population's monetary income.

Another very important condition is the lessening of sociopolitical tension, improved labor discipline, and stronger contractual ties. What is needed is common sense, a solicitous attitude toward the matter, very high universal responsibility, and the impermissibility of political ambitions. Communists have an important consolidating role to play here. The living link uniting all working people in our society cannot be allowed to be broken.

The commission's main conclusions and proposals on the draft plan for the development of the USSR national economy and the country's draft budget for 1991, in accordance with the decision of the CPSU Central Committee October (1990) Plenum, will be submitted to the USSR Supreme Soviet in the prescribed manner.

The commission also examined some organizational questions. Proposals for changes to the composition of the CPSU Central Committee Standing Socioeconomic Commission were approved for submission to the Central Committee plenum. Candidacies for advisers to the commission were discussed, to be submitted for approval at the upcoming Central Committee plenum.

Proposals to elect working groups in various areas of the commission's activity were adopted.

The commission's work plan adopted for 1990-1991 provides for a number of fundamental questions to be examined. These include problems of realizing CPSU policy in connection with the transformation of state forms of ownership, measures for the population's social protection under conditions of the transition to the market, and others.

During the discussion of problems and in practical activity the commission proposes to devote chief attention to drawing up specific recommendations on the most efficient use of the party's potential in the interests of promoting the renewal of Soviet society.

The composition of the CPSU Central Committee Permanent Socioeconomic Commission will be published in IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS.

CPSU Rules on Budget Published

91UN0513B Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
17 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

["Mechanism for Forming, Executing, and Monitoring the CPSU Budget"—PRAVDA headline]

[Text]

I. GENERAL PROVISIONS

The CPSU budget is formed from membership dues, income from publishing, production, and financial-economic activity, and voluntary contributions from communists and individual citizens, and other incomes that do not violate legislation, and expenditures on political and organizational work, the development of the economic base, and economic support for their activity.

The formation of the CPSU budget begins with the determination of the budgets of the local party organizations. Up to 50 percent of the membership dues that are used for financing their activity are a constituent part of the CPSU budget and are taken into account in its incomes and expenditures. In the CPSU budget and the budgets of the communist parties of the Union republics and republic, kray, and oblast party organizations, the funds used for the needs of the local party organizations are stipulated in a special section of the expenditure part of the budget called "financing the activity of local party organizations."

In its budget policy the CPSU proceeds from principles of self-financing, the transition of the communist parties of the Union republics to using their own sources of revenue to pay for their expenses, glasnost in the formation and execution of the party budget, its subordination to the interests of party organizations and communists, and independence of the party organizations in the disposition of their budget, and solving their structural, staff, production, financial-economic, and other problems within their competence.

For the development of proposals for financing the activity of party organizations, under the party committees they are creating financial commissions consisting of secretaries of party organizations, members of elective organs, the aktiv, specialists, and party workers. The commissions are working closely with the soviets of secretaries of local party organizations and take their decisions into account when preparing proposals.

The CPSU Central Committee is developing an overall policy for the party budget and questions of wages of workers of party organizations, providing methodological support for the financial and economic activity of party organizations, and performing other functions

envisioned by the CPSU rules and the mechanism for forming, executing, and monitoring the party budget.

Before the reports on the execution of the party budget are approved they are considered by the monitoring organs of the corresponding party organizations, as is the report on the monitoring of the CPSU budget by the CPSU Central Audit Commission

II. CPSU FINANCIAL ACTIVITY

CPSU activity is supported through local and centralized financing.

1. Local Financing

1.1. Local financing is the basis of the financial support for the activity of party organizations of the Communist Party of the Union Republic.

1.2. The communist parties of the Union republics are independent in the formation and execution of their budgets and the determination of the procedure for forming and executing the budgets of the party organizations included in them.

1.3. The budgets of the communist parties of the Union republics may be formed with distinctions among the republic, kray, and oblast areas for financing expenditures, providing through distribution and redistribution of incomes the necessary conditions for the activity of all party organizations.

1.4. The incomes of the communist parties of the Union republics include party membership dues, deductions from the profit of party publishing houses and enterprises and organizations under their jurisdiction, revenues from production and financial-economic activity, and voluntary contributions from communists and individual citizens, as well as other revenues that do not violate legislation.

Material support (subsidies) may be allotted for financing the expenditures of the communist parties of the Union republics, based on the financial capabilities of the CPSU budget.

1.5. Up to 50 percent of the membership dues and also voluntary contributions and other sources that do not violate the law are used to finance the activity of local party organizations.

To protect the funds and conduct financial operations, the local party organizations use accounts opened in keeping with the established procedure in bank branches or else they use the cash reserve of the corresponding raykom [rayon party committee] or gorkom [city party committee].

The funds are transferred by the raykoms or gorkoms to the accounts of party committees in bank institutions, or they are turned over in cash, and a report is sent to the

secretary of the party organization or the individual authorized by the party committee (bureau) to conduct financial operations.

Funds not spent in the current year and also profit from their own production-economic activity are left at the disposal of the local party organizations. Higher party committees are not allowed to withdraw funds from the local party organizations without their approval.

By a decision of the communists of the party organization, some of the funds at their disposal can be used for rendering material support to local, rayon, and city party organizations, and party veterans, and for financial support for special party programs and measures, taking into account the recommendations of finance commissions under party committees and soviets of secretaries.

1.6. The money saved from the execution of the party budget remains at the disposal of the communist parties of the Union republics and is used for financing their activity and supporting target party programs and measures.

2. Centralized Financing

2.1. Centralized financing is formed from deductions from the profit of central party publishing houses and revenues from the production and financial-economic activity of the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee and its subdivisions of the businesses and organizations under its jurisdiction, some of the membership dues of communists not registered in the territorial party organizations, and funds allotted by a decision of the CPSU Central Committee from the party insurance fund, as well as other incomes into the CPSU budget that do not violate legislation.

2.2. The communist parties of the Union republics transfer funds into the fund for centralized financing in order to provide financial support for all-party programs and measures, to render material support to party organizations in need of it, and to augment the party insurance fund.

The amount of these deductions is determined with the formation of the party budget by agreement between the CPSU Central Committee and the central committees of the communist parties of the Union republics.

2.3. Taking into account the financial capabilities of the CPSU budget, centralized financing is used to render material support (subsidies) to party organizations that are experiencing temporary financial difficulties and whose incomes were brought up to the necessary level before they were changed over to self-financing.

2.4. The following are financed from centralized funds:

- the activity of the CPSU Central Committee;
- the activity of the CPSU Central Audit Commission;
- central party institutions and educational institutions under the CPSU Central Committee;
- branches of the V.I. Lenin Central Museum;

higher party schools, in the amount of the subsidies for their maintenance, taking into account incomes from scientific research and production-economic activity, and also paid forms of training and improvement of the qualifications of personnel;

the development of a material base for party organizations and party publishing houses (construction of production facilities and economic facilities and administrative buildings);

other programs, measures, and objects that are significant to the party and whose financial support is provided by a decision of the CPSU Central Committee.

2.5. Funds from centralized financing for the maintenance of branches of the V.I. Lenin Central Museum and higher party schools and for the development of a material base for organizations and party publishing houses are especially deposited into the budgets of the corresponding communist parties of the Union republics.

2.6. Unused funds from centralized financing allotted for the construction of facilities for party organs and party publishing houses and transferred into the insurance funds depending on the results of the year. Savings on funds according to the results of the realization of estimates of branches of the V.I. Lenin Central Museum and higher party schools are left at their disposal.

2.7. The functions of centralized financing and the reconciliation of the CPSU budget are the responsibility of the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee.

III. ORGANIZATION OF MONITORING OF THE PARTY BUDGET

1. Monitoring the execution of the CPSU budget, in keeping with the rules, is the responsibility of the CPSU Central Audit Commission.

2. Monitoring the financial and economic activity of the local party organizations is conducted by the higher party committees and corresponding monitoring and monitoring-audit commissions.

3. The monitoring functions of the CPSU Central Committee include verification of the execution of the budgets of the communist parties of the Union republics and, if necessary, the party budgets of republic, kray, and oblast party organizations, as well as the correctness of the utilization of funds received for investment in production and financial-economic activity.

Special investigations are conducted on various issues of production and financial-economic activity in order to obtain data necessary for planning, the development of methodological materials, and so forth.

The Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee and party committees monitor the financial-economic activity of enterprises, organizations, and institutions under their jurisdiction.

4. Reports on the execution of the party budget and the estimate of expenditures along with inspection documents from monitoring commissions are submitted by the established deadlines by the higher party committees. Copies of inspection documents are sent to the monitoring organ of the higher party organization.

Commission Examines CPSU Privilege Abuses

91UN0513C Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
16 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[Report on a speech by Yu.A. Peskov, chairman of the CPSU Congress Commission on Privileges at recent CPSU Central Committee Plenum: "On Privileges in the Party Organs"]

[Text] *As was already reported, at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum information was heard from the commission of the 28th CPSU Congress "On Privileges in Party Organs," which was given by commission chairman Yu.A. Peskov, general director of the Rostselmash Production Association. This information elicited a lively discussion. The speakers discussed the need to get rid of distortions of the past and the inadmissibility of immoderate lifestyles and the enjoyment of undeserved benefits. The plenum ordained that party committees must wage an uncompromising battle against any forms of deviation from the norms of party ethics.*

As we know, said Yu.A. Peskov, the 28th CPSU Congress considered it necessary to form a special commission on benefits and privileges of party organs.

Members of the commission, of course, recognized how crucial the problem is and the alarm and sometimes even pain with which it is perceived in the country. There was also a good deal of slanderous material here, which is skillfully disseminated by our opponents in various rallies and meetings. Therefore it was necessary to work in such a way as to not miss cases of abuses, while at the same time protecting the honor and dignity of many communists from undeserved accusations.

Taking these circumstances into account, the commission considered all the elements of the existing system of benefits and privileges in party organs of various levels and studied the remarks and suggestions of communists and nonparty members. Let us emphasize at once that the benefits and privileges were not enjoyed by the millions of communists who make up the CPSU but by only a small part of them. Mainly the party leaders.

At the same time let us note that many leaders, as it were, conferred these privileges on themselves, which cannot be called anything but abuse, and this problem is being dealt with by other organs if these violations occurred. Not to see this means to deliberately discredit the CPSU in the eyes of the people.

But what kinds of benefits and privileges are they? The subject of letters and statements from communists and

speeches of delegates to the 28th congress and participants in the plenum of the CPSU Central Committee was the infractions in the distribution of housing, the material and technical supply, sanitarium and health resort therapy and medical service, and the use of official transportation by certain categories of party workers.

The commission has analyzed these remarks and suggestions and has become familiar with the situation that exists today in this sphere in the party committees of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, Uzbekistan, and other Union republics, seven republic, krai and oblast party organizations of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] and also directly in the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee. Moreover, they have considered the appeals from communists and nonparty members which have been addressed to the commission. What is bothering these people?

Most of all, perhaps, it is the violations that exist in the construction of buildings with improved apartment layout and distribution of housing for officials. As we know, cases like this were revealed during the inspections by the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee. They were given a strict party appraisal, and this played a role in imposing order. During the past four years in the local party organizations the overall number of apartments in buildings that were built according to individual plans amounted to little more than 10 percent of the overall number of apartments that were built. Since 1989 the planning and new construction according to individual plans of individual residential buildings for workers of party committees, both local and central, have been completely eliminated by a decision of the CPSU Central Committee.

The functions of the client, the builder of the residential buildings, including the city of Moscow, were transferred to organizations of the local soviets. In order to obtain dwelling space, party committees at all levels transfer money for shared participation in housing construction to the local budget. The dwelling space obtained from these funds is allotted to workers of the party committees on a general basis and documented according to the established procedure by the local soviets of people's deputies in keeping with the norms envisioned by legislation.

Now the distribution of dwelling space is regulated for workers of the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee, enterprises and organizations under its jurisdiction, central party institutions, and regional party committees. But one must admit that this work has not yet been completed everywhere, which is shown, in particular, by the commission's inspections. Therefore the CPSU Central Committee must strengthen control over the distribution of housing and hold parties guilty of violations strictly accountable. At the same time one cannot but note that, as a result of the illegal acts on the part of certain ispolkoms [executive committees] of the city of Moscow and other cities as well, a certain indebtedness of apartments built with party funds which have

not yet been turned over to party organizations for distribution and habitation has been formed. Apartments built by the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee on a shared basis with the city ispolkom have been taken back and funds deposited for shared construction with the USSR Council of Ministers, the Ministry of Defense, the Ministry of Special Construction and Installation, and other organizations have been returned.

Because of this the Administration of Affairs is now experiencing serious difficulties in providing housing for officials of the CPSU Central Committee who have been recommended from the local areas. Similar cases exist in other regions of the country as well.

A study of the situation with dacha service for party workers shows that much of what previously attracted the attention of the public here has changed recently. The party obkoms [oblast committees] and kraykoms [kray committees], the republic committees, and the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of the Union republics, as we know, did not have dachas. The only exceptions are five party committees—of the Ukraine, Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and the Leningrad and Moscow party organizations.

Certain categories of workers of a number of party organs have used dachas officially assigned to the soviets. This has comprised approximately seven to eight percent of the overall number of accommodations in dachas. As the inspection showed, at the present time the majority have declined to use these dachas. It is known that in the CPSU Central Committee up to the present time there has been a completely unjustified categorical ban on the workers obtaining and using private dachas or garden plots. This is incomprehensible to us. For this reason the network has not developed at all in the Moscow area and there are only suburban boarding houses of the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee. During the summer they are used by workers of the apparatus of the Central Committee, central party institutions, and enterprises and organizations under their jurisdiction. Payment for dacha space, the use of furniture, supplies, and municipal services is made by all categories of workers at existing state rates. The vacationers buy their food with cash.

Members of the commission inspected the dachas occupied by members of the Politburo, secretaries of the CPSU Central Committee, and also workers of the Central Committee apparatus. The commission did not find any cases of use without payment of premises, furniture, or supplies or the use of delicacies in the preparation of meals. Everything was examined right down to the invoices in the dining rooms and cafeterias. The dachas were paid for according to the generally accepted procedures.

But this cannot compensate for all the expenditures for the functioning of houses of recreation, boarding houses, and dacha establishments located in Moscow. During

the past three years the subsidy has amounted to approximately from 4.7 to 4.9 million rubles [R]. In 1990 it is expected to be R1.9 million, that is, the subsidy will have decreased by R3 million.

In order to reduce expenditures, work has now been started on leasing the Moscow area premises to other organizations on a contractual basis during the fall and winter period. This will make it possible as early as 1990 to reduce the subsidy for maintaining them by half.

In the opinion of the commission, the leaders and social organizations of the apparatus of party organizations should raise before the local soviets the question of allotting workers of the party apparatus, including the CPSU Central Committee, plots of land under general conditions for organizing gardening societies.

At the same time, in our view, the Central Committee plenum should solve the problem of allotting the necessary amounts of subsidies since it is not practical to introduce a system of cost recovery in boarding houses, houses of recreation, and dacha establishments. I shall give the figures. Passes to houses of recreation, sanatoriums, and boarding houses will cost from R600 to R1,500 per month. I do not think any of us will be able to purchase that kind of pass for himself. Therefore it is necessary to arrange things so that the system of subsidies is the same as the ones that exist today in health facilities belonging to state administrative organs and trade unions. In any collective and at the plant a pass with a maximum value of R200 is allotted to trade union members. According to existing provisions, he pays 30 percent, i.e. R66, of the overall sum. This level should be retained for workers of party organs as well.

The question of regulating medical and sanatorium-health resort services for party workers is crucial. The system of the Fourth Main Administration under the Ministry of Health has now been eliminated. The majority of workers of local party organs have been assigned to medical institutions in their place of residence. As for officials of the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee and members of their families, they are served on a cost accounting basis by a polyclinic of the treatment and health association of the USSR Council of Ministers. Technical workers and also workers of the central party institutions, party publishing houses, enterprises, and subdivisions of the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee and members of their families receive medical aid in medical and hospital units of the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee.

Excluded from these medical institutions are children of apparatus workers over 18 years of age who previously, while in school, were assigned along with their parents.

Having inspected the situation in this sphere, the commission is proposing that some of this contingent be reassigned from the treatment and health association of the USSR Council of Ministers to the medical and hospital units of the CPSU Central Committee. At the

same time, it is necessary to solve problems of treatment of workers of the party apparatus and party publishing houses in the republics, krays, and oblasts.

Today the party has 23 sanatorium and health resort institutions with 7,100 beds. This comprises 0.28 percent of the overall number in the country's system of sanatorium and health resort institutions. There are so many discussions and conjectures about this! Recently considerable measures have been taken to use party sanatoriums and houses of recreation in the interests of the population. I must report to you, Comrades, that in Tyumen Oblast the Sibir Sanatorium, which is under construction, has been transferred to the mother and child sanatorium. The Kratovo children's sanatorium in the Moscow area has been transferred to the RSFSR Ministry of Public Health. They have solved the problem of transferring one of the physical plants of the Gornyy Vozdukh sanatorium to the city of Zheleznovodsk (although my personal opinion is that there are still some things to think about here), and also the Sanatorium imeni XXII Syezda KPSS in the Crimea, which is being used as a base for organizing the central scientific research institute of tuberculosis. The Rus Sanatorium in the Moscow area has been reprofiled into a center for medical rehabilitation for international military servicemen.

The principle for the organization of the work of CPSU sanatorium and health resort institutions is changing. Agreements have been concluded for 1990 with 80 labor collectives of agriculture, industry, transportation, and others, in which more than 14,000 passes have been sold. They include: the Yavolgauz Balgunda interkolkhoz association from Latvia, the Shirokoye Sovkhoz in Crimea Oblast, the Roskolkhozzdravitsa Association, the Gorkiy, Kama, and Moscow automotive plants, the Tyumengaz Administration, and many others. Moreover, 5,000 passes have been allotted for improving the health of the population living in polluted territories in the zone of the Chernobyl nuclear power plant disaster.

These measures make it possible to transform health facilities of the CPSU Central Committee from departmental ones into sanatorium and health resort institutions that are open to the broad segments of the population. In 1989 workers of party organs and the government comprised only 32 percent of the overall number of people taking rest and treatment in health facilities of the CPSU, and during the first half of 1990 this figure was 23 percent. We have stepped up control over issuing passes to health facilities for workers of the party apparatus.

At the present time all categories of workers of party organs receive passes to sanatoriums for 20 percent of the cost, and houses of recreation—for 30 percent of the cost. This is not different from the approaches being used in the national economy and in trade unions. They retain the right to obtain a priority pass with a rebate of 50 percent for one member of the family—the wife or

husband—for secretaries and department heads of Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union republics, republic, kray, and oblast central committees, first secretaries of district, city, and rayon committees, and also officials of the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee. Other categories of party workers do not have these rights.

At the present time the CPSU Central Committee is receiving appeals from various departments and even party committees to have the health facilities transferred to their jurisdiction. The commission thinks that the health facilities of the Administration of Affairs are general party property and an integral part of the party material base, and we are resolutely against squandering it. In order to maintain the party's sanatorium and health resort complex at the proper level, it must continue to be under the jurisdiction of the CPSU Central Committee and continue to develop in the future. Such is the commission's opinion.

At the same time we recommend that the Central Committee contrive a mechanism for distribution of passes which takes into account the interests of party veterans and all communists.

A good deal has been done recently to regulate the system of automotive transportation service for workers of party committees and party institutions. It is being provided mainly by the conveyor system. The right to have an official car for personal use has been taken away from chiefs of divisions of Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union republics, kraykoms, and obkoms, and first deputies and deputies chiefs of departments of the CPSU Central Committee. The limit has been removed from automotive transportation service for pensioners who are former heads of departments of the CPSU Central Committee and first secretaries of oblast, kray, and republic party committees.

Now I must speak about myself personally. Each concrete case regarding former party leaders must be approached individually. We must not forget about these people who have given their lives to the party.

The right to personal service is enjoyed by members of the Politburo, secretaries and department heads of the CPSU Central Committee, and secretaries of obkoms, kraykoms, and Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union republics. Members of the Politburo and secretaries of Central Committees have been changed over to service with GAZ-31-02 Volga cars by the transportation section of the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee. The limit on the use of automobiles for former members and candidate members of the Politburo has been reduced significantly.

Measures are being taken for further reduction of allocations for automotive transportation. The budget draft envisions reducing expenditures by more than 30 percent. We assume that, taking into account the regulation that has been carried out, it will be necessary to curtail the personal automotive transportation service for these

categories of workers of the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee and local party organs, and also PRAVDA correspondents. Other workers will be granted the right to use automobiles according to the conveyor system.

At the same time the commission thinks that the central committees of the communist parties of the Union republics and the CPSU kraykoms and obkoms have the right to determine for themselves, within the limits of the funds allotted to them, the system for the most efficient use of transportation for serving workers of the apparatus and journalists of the central party newspapers.

The Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee also has jurisdiction over consumer service enterprises which satisfy the needs of subdivisions of the apparatus and suburban business for laundry and dry cleaning.

Workers of local party committees take advantage of consumer services the same as all other categories of the population—there is a studio of the first category in every city. There were studios for custom tailoring of clothing and repair and manufacture of footwear only on the books of the Central Committee of the Communist Party of Belorussia, which served workers of Minsk party committees. But now it, too, has been transferred to the consumer service system.

As you recall, at the last plenum one of the speakers raised the question of the correctness of selling books at discounted prices to members of the CPSU Central Committee. Indeed, the book department of the Administration of Affairs of the CPSU Central Committee does provide service for members of Central Committees and Central Audit Commissions, secretaries of obkoms and kraykoms, Central Committees of Communist Parties of Union republics, rectors of higher party schools, and also leaders of the Central Committee apparatus and central party institutions. The literature is acquired for cash, with payment for postal and expediting expenses. A large portion of the books submitted for discounting is literature on political and socioeconomic issues and also artistic works—mainly Russian and foreign classics. The book department itself is an autonomously financed enterprise and there are no allocations from the CPSU budget for maintaining it; on the contrary, it produces a profit. We think this system should be preserved.

A couple of words about the public catering system. As a rule, the local party committees do not have their own dining rooms. Workers of party organs are served by branches of enterprises of the public catering system. Only the Central Committees of the Communist Parties of Belorussia, Kazakhstan, and the Ukraine, and the Nizhegorod and Leningrad Party Obkoms have their own dining rooms. Food prices in them are set according to existing norms. They are all autonomously financed and receive no subsidies from party budgets.

The public catering system of the apparatus of the CPSU Central Committee is provided with groceries in the same way as other organizations' public catering institutions and departments according to the funds allocated by the ispolkom of the Moscow Soviet Ispolkom within the limits of the assortment of groceries it has. No budget subsidies from the CPSU budget are envisioned for these purposes. I must say that only one organization has left the notorious 208th base so far—the CPSU Central Committee. Four organizations have come to replace it.

When studying the system of benefits and privileges, the commission was unable to sidestep the question of food orders. There is no system of food orders as such. They have abolished the right of individual leaders of the Communist Party apparatus to use the special dining room for special food and improved orders to obtain food supplies through the cafeterias.

As for holiday food orders for apparatus workers, in our opinion, they are no different from any others which are submitted in other Moscow collectives. It is just that their assortment is considerably worse. I personally examined the list of the holiday selection by 7 November.

At one time there was a great deal of reaction to the wage increase for party workers. As we know, it was given at the same time as the number of employees of the party apparatus was reduced, and this process is continuing. Under the conditions of the growing disproportion between the wages of party workers and cadres in the sphere of production, the CPSU Central Committee Politburo has started to regulate earnings and introduce new salaries for full-time workers of local party organizations and workers of party organs at all levels.

They have been established for the wages of workers of state administrative organs and leaders and specialists of enterprises and production branches. The salaries of technical workers and economic personnel have been established in relation to the salaries of the corresponding categories of workers of enterprises and organizations in operation in the country's national economy. As in the state administrative organs, party workers receive bonuses in the amount of two months' wages and illness stipends in the amount of a month's salary. In general, life has shown that today party workers are still not the highest paid. What can we say, then, about those who work in the sphere of the party press? It is time for workers of CPSU publications to create the necessary conditions for fruitful work, recreation, and health care.

Thus the commission's study of the existing practice of material and domestic support for party workers makes it possible to draw the conclusion that the party committees have done significant work to eliminate previous errors. The commission thinks that the concepts "communists" and "privileges" are incompatible. At the same time, we are firmly convinced that workers of the party apparatus like members of any labor collective must

create normal conditions for labor, life, and recreation. But only within the framework of the law and without any abuses or excesses. Therefore the policy for serving party workers, taking into account the work that has been done to regulate and abolish the benefits mentioned in the report (if they can be called privileges—in my opinion, this is normal existence) should be taken as the norm for their material and living support.

The commission considers it necessary for the CPSU Central Committee at the Fourth Congress of USSR People's Deputies to present a legislative initiative concerning additions to Article 34 of the USSR Constitution with approximately the following content: Nobody in the USSR may enjoy illegal privileges. Nobody. Because today everyone is blaming the CPSU, but behind it are so many organizations and workers that it is difficult to count them all. The adoption by the CPSU Central Committee Plenum of a decision on this question will contribute to further development of the process of democratization of the life and activity of the party. Party committees and control and audit commissions must not let up on the attention they pay to the actual observance of the norms of social justice in the party. They must react in a principled way to the facts and violations that are disclosed.

Ivashko Chairs Party Economic Discussion

PM1012151590 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Russian 8 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Conference at the CPSU Central Committee"]

[Text] V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, has chaired a conference of secretaries of Union republic Communist Party Central Committees in charge of questions relating to socioeconomic policy.

During the conference, the implementation of party socioeconomic policy drawn up by the 28th CPSU Congress, the decisions of the CPSU Central Committee October (1990) Plenum, and the switch to market conditions, demand—in the current critical situation—considerable intensification of party influence upon measures stabilizing the country's economy. The maintenance and strengthening of economic ties among enterprises and the observance of contractual discipline by them—regardless of their departmental affiliation and territorial location—must occupy a very important place within the system of these measures.

Party organizations must ensure, with all their power, that enterprises operate steadily from the very outset of the new year. Every labor collective must be conscious of its role and responsibility for the state of affairs in the national economy and for the country's future. The Communists must energetically counter local favoritism, group interests, and breaking of contractual commitments, irresponsibility, and laxity.

Conference participants spoke of the need for energetic action by party committees to strengthen the USSR and maintain a single economic space. Here it was stressed that the real political and economic content of the future federative structure of the state must be aimed at meeting the needs of the country and individual republics and defending the interests of all Soviet people.

The Union republic Communist Party Central Committee secretaries stated that republic party organizations will seek with all the political methods at their disposal to bring about constructive shifts in the economy and to deepen contacts in order to develop joint actions and solve long-term and immediate socioeconomic tasks by sharing experience.

A.V. Vlasov, chief of the CPSU Central Committee Socioeconomic Policy Department, took part in the conference.

Ivashko Meets With Social Sciences Academy

PM1112163590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian 8 Dec 90 Second Edition p 2

[R. Sergeyev report: "Meeting With Scientists"]

[Text] The 28th CPSU Congress' course of radically renewing the party is closely linked with the reorganization of the system of its scientific and educational establishments. Proposals in this direction have been elaborated of late with the participation of the country's major scientists, and they will be examined in the immediate future by the CPSU Central Committee Secretariat. A meeting between V.A. Ivashko, deputy general secretary of the CPSU Central Committee, and the science-teaching personnel of the CPSU Central Committee Academy of Social Sciences was also devoted to these problems.

They discussed directions for the further development of the academy. Ivashko pointed out that this establishment in the form in which it has developed does not fully ensure the implementation of the new tasks which are being resolved within the process of restructuring the CPSU, the state, and society. The standard of training of academy graduates working in party, state, and public organizations does not always agree with the demands of the time and the worsening political struggle. The meeting's participants advocated the radical restructuring of the work of the Academy of Social Sciences, should be based on the creative development of social sciences, to provide a reliable theoretical base for the transformations of society and the party. The scientists are faced with the task of creatively analyzing the problems involved in the development of Soviet society and the modern world and helping to formulate and implement the CPSU's scientifically grounded policy.

In short, the academy should be the CPSU scientific and educational center capable of resolving tasks of a theoretical, analytical, and prognostic character and examining draft political decisions. Its contacts with the

USSR Academy of Sciences, universities, and the country's other scientific and educational establishments should be broadened and the achievements of world social science thinking analyzed and translated into the language of politics.

The meeting's participants exchanged opinions on the role of the party's science education establishments in cooperating with various socialist political formations, cooperating with state organs and public organizations, instructing party workers in the skills of parliamentary activity, working with voters, and shaping young political leaders.

The deputy general secretary favored pooling the efforts of scientific academies in studying the market transition and offering an objectively analysis of historical processes and the problems of multiethnic relations. Studies in the sphere of political science, social psychology, and Soviet and world culture should be considerably expanded and talented young researchers and teachers enlisted from other higher educational establishments and scientific centers.

PRAVDA Roundtable Debates Union Treaty

91UN0458A Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
10 Dec 90 Second Edition p 4

[Report on PRAVDA roundtable discussion moderated by Academician I. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and PRAVDA editor in chief, prepared by O. Losoto and G. Ovcharenko; place and date not given: "A Federation of Equals"]

[Text] *What should the Soviet Union be? In many ways the answer to this question depends on what the new Union treaty will be like, and whether the Union republics will sign it. A draft of this document was published recently, and heated debates immediately raged around it.*

A discussion of the draft Union treaty also took place at a PRAVDA "roundtable." Participating in the discussion were: V. Kudryavtsev, academician and vice president of the USSR Academy of Sciences; G. Tarasevich, chairman of the Commission on National Policy and Interethnic Relations of the USSR Supreme Soviet; B. Lazarev, deputy chairman of the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee and doctor of juridical sciences; D. Kerimov, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences; A. Zhuravlev, deputy chairman of the Commission on Labor, Prices, and Social Policy Questions of the USSR Supreme Soviet and doctor of economic sciences; V. Zots, doctor of philosophical sciences and consultant on the staff of the USSR president; V. Tumanov, doctor of juridical sciences and official of the State and Law Institute of the USSR Academy of Sciences; R. Yengibaryan, doctor of juridical sciences and consultant in the CPSU Central Committee Ideological Department.

The meeting was moderated by Academician I. Frolov, member of the CPSU Central Committee Politburo and PRAVDA editor in chief.

From Ideas to the Draft

[Frolov] There is no need here, where those who are present took part in the development and preparation of the text of the draft Union treaty, to talk about the significance of this document. In essence, the question that is being decided is what our state should be. There are many discussions today in this regard, and they are also expected at the CPSU Central Committee plenum and the forthcoming USSR Congress of People's Deputies. A stream of letters is also coming into the editorial office from our readers who are asking for an explanation of one or another provision of the draft Union treaty. In particular, they are asking why the concept of a "socialist republic" was left out.

Incidentally, attention was given to this abroad as well. THE WASHINGTON POST writes frankly that the removal of the word "socialist" from the name of the country is a critically important ideological change as is its change to "sovereign." THE NEW YORK TIMES and THE GUARDIAN also note the same fact. The opinion of Shlyayker, director of the Swiss Federalism Institute, who is probably well-known to you, is interesting: When the republics get down to business, he writes, they will plunge into economic and social problems, and they will turn to the center for assistance in the coordination of macroeconomic processes. History cannot be changed, and it is impossible to break off thousands of economic and social ties.

I think that a majority of people share this opinion, and it is presented with sufficient clarity in the draft of the new Union treaty. Actually, as was noted by the USSR president in his speech of 17 November, we will not be able to separate. Everything speaks in favor of a renewed Soviet Union existing as a single state, because its division is fraught with great negative consequences, not only for us but for the overall situation in the world.

In a word, the draft Union treaty gives us a lot of food for thought, analysis, and constructive proposals. And the aim of our discussion today is to bring the contents of the document to the people, and to turn attention to both its pluses and minuses.

[Tarasevich] Of course, the urgency of the new Union treaty and the necessity for its speedy signing is a result of the entire course of perestroika. Incidentally, I would like to mention that the last parliament also was involved in the problem of delimiting powers. As far back as sometime in 1987 a special commission was established, which I was charged to head, and we were engaged precisely in the problem of delimiting powers.

[Frolov] Incidentally, many are saying today that we are late and that we are lagging behind events by prolonging the signing of a new Union treaty.

[Tarazevich] There is a grain of truth in this, but not entirely. In reality, the problem of mutual relations at one time receded into the background. And there were reasons for this. You will recall that the first elections of USSR People's Deputies were on a democratic alternative basis, and their first congress immediately became enmeshed in a web of problems, which they could not crawl out of immediately. Although even then many deputies proposed precisely starting with a Union treaty. But here already, it seems to me, the center began to be cautious. That is, it did not seize the initiative that was coming from the republics.

Nonetheless, starting this summer with the consultations with representatives of the republics on the draft treaty and its conception, the work moved ahead aggressively. It revealed a rather broad spread of opinions. Various ideas surfaced. For example, a Union republic without a Union state. Or an economic union without a political union. Some completely excluded the presence of Union property. All of the ideas were studied carefully, and the outline for the formation of a treaty appeared and, although it was vague, it satisfied everyone. Afterwards, a special preparatory committee was set up headed by the president which, on the basis of consultations with the republics and the proposals of scientists, specialists, and various political currents, worked up the draft that we are now considering.

[Lazarev] All lawyers and theoreticians who are engaged in problems of state law admitted that it was necessary to reform the national-state structure of our country in a cardinal way, but there were arguments about how to do this best. There was the opinion: Let us change the appropriate chapter of the Constitution and the appropriate norms of the Constitution. It has been said that a treaty was necessary for the creation of a Union, but it was already established by the treaty of 1922, and it could be renewed simply by making changes to the Constitution. However, the treaty route was considered more preferable. Why? If there were simply an agreement on changes to the Constitution, then the final word in the reformation of the state structure of the country would belong to the Union parliament. But if we take the treaty route, then the final word will be given by the republics themselves. Such a route takes their interests and their positions into account to a greater extent, although it is more difficult than the constitutional version for resolving the problem in question.

[Frolov] We proceed from the fact that a Union treaty is necessary and a federation is necessary. But what if a republic refuses to sign the Union treaty?

[Lazarev] I think that this does not mean that republic thereby automatically secedes from the Union. No, as is stated in the draft Union treaty, it will continue to live on the basis of legislation currently in force, which is based on the Union treaty of 1922. Therefore, if it wishes to secede from the Union, a referendum has to be held in the republic. This is the only permissible version of

legislation in force for resolving the secession question. This means that not signing the treaty does not denote secession from the Union.

[Kerimov] Forgive me, I am sorry to say it but the Union treaty is being rejected by leaders who are more concerned about seizing power and satisfying their own excessive ambitions than with the needs and welfare of the people and social progress. Joining the Union or seceding from it—this is a matter for the people, its inalienable, if you please, natural right. It can be implemented only through a national referendum, and in no other way. But the leaders that are coming out against a referendum are precisely those who are pulling their republics out of the Union. They understand that the people do not support them, and that they will not want to shear the thousands of threads not only of a political, economic, defense, and ecological nature, but also of a cultural, moral, and even ethical nature.

To Trade or To Fight?

[Zhuravlev] In answer to the question as to who can be considered an intelligent person, one of the ancient sages replied: He who does not set unattainable tasks for himself. That is right, the aim of breaking up in a peaceful way now in principle is unattainable. We can either trade or fight. Now we must figure out what we intend to do. If we assume that some Union republics will not sign the Union treaty, and we intend to live in peace, let us think about how we will trade. In this event, it is not possible to change the place of meeting: We can meet with the republic seceding from the Union only on the world market, and it, like a court of arbitration, will judge who is who, who in this case will perish and who will survive. But name just one Union republic today that is in a position to choose this form of trade? But there can be no other form of trade. Why? Because the remaining part of the Union, inasmuch as we are going for fundamental and decisive changes, nonetheless will have to adopt decisive measures in the convertibility of the ruble.

But will we then strengthen our ruble and trade with those republics leaving the Union for their paper rubles?! Of course not. This means that those economic ties owing to which all republics without exception exist today will be broken. But take our Union gold reserve, on the basis of which ruble convertibility can be supported. In our country it is common to all of the republics. How is it to be divided up? If we scatter into national quarters, there will be no common economic space, and there also will be no common market.

Second. Let us assume that we are for monetary reform. I would like the leaders of all of the Union republics who are calling on their people to separate from the Soviet Union to answer their population: Who will ensure the purchasing power and guarantee the safekeeping of those monetary savings that accumulated in the Union system? Therefore, I think that it must be understood

absolutely clearly that now, at present and under current conditions, I emphasize this, separation is impossible in principle.

I, for example, look on the new Union treaty as a kind of provisional document, in that no document can be signed for all times. I would propose signing a Union treaty, let us say, for the period of the transition to a market economy, when conditions of withdrawal from the Soviet Union will be created in the country that are sufficiently painless from an economic standpoint. This has to be said openly.

[Zots] I agree. But I think that not only this has to be explained to the people. Many, I know this from the president's mail, are disturbed by the fact, as I. Frolov has already said, that the identification "socialist republics" has disappeared from the draft.

From Force to Reason

[Zhuravlev] I see nothing bad in this. There is not one country whose name has the word "capitalist" in it. Just as there was never a country that was called "slaveholding" or "feudal." So, the issue does not lie in this but in that orientation which is the foundation of our state and the foundation of the draft Union treaty. Its most important principle is the priority of individual rights. If we are talking about the fact that we are orienting ourselves on individual rights, and that we are for humanism, then we are heading for socialism. In general, I will allow myself to express an extreme point of view in this regard. But if there is a thesis, there is also an antithesis. What is the antipode of socialism? It is usually said, capitalism. But I think that it is fascism. For the reason that socialism is a society that is constructed on moral principles, on individual rights, but fascism is that which is built on violence. But we have already made a choice in the draft, and we are going from force to reason, from evil to good. So, we are heading for socialism. Here it is the essence that is important, not the name.

[Tumanov] Here is what I want to turn attention to: Some republics are almost beginning to see the Union treaty as a real international-legal treaty. Sovereign states have assembled and are concluding an international treaty. This is absolutely incorrect. There are some features of an international treaty here, undoubtedly, but in its nature it is a constitutional or, as the lawyers say, a public-legal treaty. In general, from the standpoint of international law the treaty, concluded by members of the federation, is not viewed as an international treaty. This has to be approached with understanding.

But then what do others think? A republic refuses to sign this treaty, and it is immediately as free as a bird that can fly wherever it likes, forgetting about former legal, economic, social, and international obligations. It is not without reason that there is anxiety in the West about the processes that are taking place in our country. Therefore, I would consider it advisable to supplement the seventh paragraph in the section "Basic Principles," which

speaks very nicely about the struggle for peace, with this statement: The republics ratify all previously concluded international agreements of the Soviet Union and consider themselves obligated to abide by them in any circumstances. From my standpoint, such a statement would be very useful.

[Sots] All of us must clearly understand that a Soviet federation can be strong and powerful only based on profound and sincere realization by all the people and nations of our country of the importance of joint cooperation. We must make it clear that no one is planning to keep anyone within the framework of a federative organization by force. And such a step was taken recently by the adoption of an appropriate law. It guarantees the genuinely free desire of the people of any republic through a referendum.

These Are the Realities...

[Frolov] If we sum up what has been said, we have come to the conclusion on the necessity of concluding a new Union treaty. But then do all of its provisions, in our opinion, respond to the realities of today?

[Zhuravlev] I do not think that there will be unanimity here. For example, the fate of the Supreme Soviet disturbs me: Is its legislative and supervisory role in the state not being infringed upon with the establishment of the Council of the Federation provided for in the draft treaty? I think that in many ways the functions of the legislature are being readdressed to it. Thought must be given to how legislative authority will be combined with the Council of the Federation. In my opinion, it would be possible to resolve this question if the Council of the Federation became a new structure of state authority in the future, for example, corresponding to a chamber of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

[Kudryavtsev] Only the transitional forms of governing and legislative authority are being elaborated. Those changes that have been offered and are being reviewed are directed precisely not only at strengthening executive authority but also at increasing the role of the republics in governing the country. I cannot agree that legislative authority is shifting to the Council of the Federation. This is not in the draft treaty, if it is properly interpreted. The Council of the Federation in fact is an organ consisting of presidents. I think that an organ consisting only of presidents of the Union republics and the president of the country cannot and must not have a legislative function. Nevertheless, the legislative functions for the representatives of the people must have a broader, so to say, expression. This is the first point that I wanted to make. Second: What changes have now taken place in the Council of the Federation?

I think that they are quite substantive, because it is being transformed from an advisory organ under the president to a decisionmaking organ. Changes are also being made in the rights and members of the Council of the Federation. In particular, they not only take part in making

decisions but also monitor the progress of their fulfillment and make objections against decisions of state organs that contradict the laws of the Union and autonomous republics.

[Lazarev] Fears that the Council of the Federation will be above the USSR Supreme Soviet and its chambers, in my opinion, are not warranted. And this is why. If a decision of the Council of the Federation infringes on the jurisdiction of the USSR Supreme Soviet or the Congress of People's Deputies, then it is reviewed in legislature. So that, in my opinion, the Council of the Federation can take an independent place in the overall mechanism of the organs of management and authority of our federation.

[Tarazevich] But, still, explain to me why the Council of the Federation, as is written in the draft treaty, is given the authority to implement the coordination of activity of higher organs of state authority and management of the Union and the republics. It turns out that it coordinates the activity of the Supreme Soviet and of its deputies?

[Kudryavtsev] It is a question of coordination between authority and management. But, I agree that the wording in the draft is not legally correct, and it is possible that a more accurate and clear formulation is needed.

When Will the 'War of Laws' End?

[Zots] I am not a lawyer, but it seems to me hardly possible to talk about real successes of the federation and a renewed Union if the "war of laws" continues between the republics and the Union, and the autonomies and the republics.

The strength of the new Union will depend on the degree of realization of the will of the legislators and the condition under which the law—the principal regulator of social relations under which the supremacy of the law as an act of higher juridical force has a place in a rule-of-law system—is adopted by the legislature, and so forth. If we are talking specifically about the degree of realization of the will of the legislators, then the "war of laws" is now ruining many good wishes.

[Kerimov] We are all concerned about the regrettable situation in which our laws, unfortunately, are not always implemented. I think that our legal science has not yet adequately developed an effective mechanism of legal application. But at the same time it is apparent to every lawyer that a law is only a law in the event that after conviction it also employs a mechanism of compulsion. And for some reason we are forgetting about this today.

[Tumanov] It seems to me that the Constitutional Oversight Committee should have had its say in the "war of laws." But it did not do this, and it still remains in the background.

Therefore, its reorganization into a Constitutional Court, which is envisaged in the draft Union treaty, I think, will be useful and timely. It is this institution that has been entrusted with the function of verifying the conformity of the laws of the USSR and of the republics to the Union treaty and the USSR Constitution, and it will resolve arguments between the Union and a republic if these arguments cannot be settled through conciliation procedures. I hope that the Constitutional Court will be able to lessen the fire of tension between the center and the regions in any case, if not put it out entirely.

It Is Up to the Republics

[Yengibaryan] I think that the "war of laws" flared up because of the situation of unequal rights of different peoples and regions in the Union. Unfortunately, this question also has not been entirely resolved in the Union treaty. So, tell me, who in our country, according to the draft treaty, are the members of the Council of the Federation? The presidents (heads of states) of the republics! But who signs a treaty? Again the republics! But what kind of republics?

[Lazarev] All of the republics.

[Yengibaryan] But we do not have 15 republics anymore, we have 35 all told. You see, a majority of the autonomous republics removed the designation of autonomous from themselves. They want to be equal in the Union, and go directly to the center. Does this mean that they also must sign the Union treaty?

[Lazarev] Of course. But only in the event that they are legislatively formed as independent sovereign republics.

[Yengibaryan] This is theory. But look at practice. Lithuania rejects autonomy for Poles. Moldova, for the Gagauz, and so forth. Now, another side of the question. It is written in the Union treaty: The republics build their mutual relations on the basis...of noninterference in internal affairs. But this very same treaty implies that we live in one state. And so imagine that I am a people's deputy and a member of the USSR Supreme Soviet, and that a negative event occurs in Armenia or in Azerbaijan which destabilizes the situation in the whole country. Well, do I not have the right to interfere in these events only because I am from another republic?

[Lazarev] Incidentally, in discussing the draft Union treaty, the line on noninterference was written in exactly on the demand of Armenia, Azerbaijan, Latvia...

[Yengibaryan] It is not a question of who demanded it but a question of principle. Not one person of any nationality in any republic should have his rights infringed. And what happens? For example, does an Armenian have the right to become the president of Latvia, and an Estonian, of Georgia?

[Zots] The right exists, but there is no possibility.

[Yengibaryan] True. The individual rights of nonindigenous nationalities are being infringed upon, and tension

is increasing. And if we will infringe on the rights of whole national-territorial formations, assigning them a secondary role in the treaty, will they agree to live by such a treaty?

[Tarazevich] Of course not. And I think that there is a question here. Of course, it can be said that autonomous formations enter into the Union as part of a republic, and that they realize their rights and interests through the republics. But, I think that not all of them will agree to this. And here, apparently, some kind of refinements are needed in the draft.

[Kudryavtsev] There are contradictions here. But it is difficult to resolve them in one document, especially one that was created on concession and conciliation principles. And, still, the draft gives the kind of independence to all republics that they did not have previously. Here is the fifth provision of the basic principles of the draft: The republics independently determine their own state structure, administrative-territorial division, and system of organs of authority and management. It is further said here that they are against any tendencies toward authoritarianism and arbitrariness.

[Tarazevich] But both Union republic and autonomous republic are understood under the word republic, but their rights are not equal.

[Lazarev] Excuse me. Look at the first article of the treaty. Do you see? "The republic-participants in the treaty are either in the Union directly or as a part of other republics, which—caution!—does not infringe upon rights and does not relieve them of obligations under the treaty."

It was said today that it is not entirely clear who is an object of the Union. But in my opinion, it is clear: all republics. Both Union republics and those republics that continue to consider themselves autonomous, and those who removed the word from the designation but who remain a part of a Union republic. The main thing here is more clearly and sensibly to delineate the jurisdictions, authorities, and obligations of the center and the republics, and of the republics and the autonomous formations.

[Yengibaryan] If the delineation of these authorities are not clearly defined in the draft treaty, the autonomies will hardly want to live by its principles.

[Kerimov] In my opinion, to calm down these passions, the most democratic way is to offer all republics—both Union and autonomous and all national-territorial formations—an opportunity to sign the Union treaty, if at the time of the signing of the treaty they acquired the status of a state.

But It Is Thundering...

[Zhuravlev] So we argued: Will the republics sign the treaty or not, and if they do, where is the guarantee that it will be implemented? I think that there is such a

guarantee. It lies in the realization of that danger which exists in the event we do not come to an agreement and do not sign the treaty. It is said that some people make the sign of the cross only when it thunders. Well, it is now thundering above us.

[Zots] I want to talk about one factor that we missed. It is known that culture, as the most universal manifestation of the human spirit, is called on to join into one whole, the political, economic, and social aspects of the concept of the Union that is being formed. At times it remains the only bridge that unites the people. Therefore, I am especially gratified by the sixth paragraph of the basic principles of the Union treaty, which denotes the fact that the republics consider it a very important task to preserve and develop national traditions and state support for education, science, and culture.

The Union treaty will live if it is suffused with the spirit of great culture.

[Tarazevich] I think that all of us must be thankful to PRAVDA, which organized our meeting. Unfortunately, the information resources are still not yet adequately explaining the problems of the Union treaty, or are doing so in a one-sided way. We are not reporting to the people frankly, openly, and loudly all of those fears that could materialize if the Union breaks up, and even if one or another republic comes out of it.

[Frolov] I think that we have had a substantive and constructive conversation, even though we are not unanimous on all questions. Well, that is as it should be: For, in fact, we are just entering into a discussion of the draft of the new Union treaty. But I am confident that our discussion of the project has also confirmed this: Everyone who is for stabilization of the situation and for the economic and social renewal of the USSR recognizes the need to sign it.

Debate at Managers' Conference Summarized

PM1012113590 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
7 Dec 90 Second Edition pp 1, 2

[A. Nikitin report: "The Economy on the Threshold of the Market"]

[Excerpts] An all-Union assembly of leaders of state enterprises opened yesterday in Moscow. About 3,000 directors gathered in the Kremlin Palace of Congresses, and more than 450 leaders submitted requests to speak right at the beginning of the meeting. This was a mark of the temper of the managers, who are facing an accumulation of problems regarding the stabilization of the economy and specific features of their work next year in conditions of the transition to market relations.

The government has shown great interest in the gathering. Participating in the meeting with prominent managers are M.S. Gorbachev, N.I. Ryzhkov, and A.I. Lukyanov; leaders of republics and Union ministries and departments; chairmen of kray and oblast soviet of

people's deputies ispolkoms [executive committees]; and leaders of territorial organs of the State Committee for Material and Technical Supply. The gathering was organized at the initiative of the Union of Associations of State Industrial, Construction, and Transport and Communications Enterprises, set up in the course of the perestroika of the economy. [passage omitted]

Reports were also delivered by L.A. Voronin, first deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; L.I. Abalkin, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; and A.I. Tizyakov, president of the Union of Associations of State Industrial, Construction, and Transport and Communications Enterprises. N.M. Pichugin, general director of the "Kursk" Leather Footwear Association; G.V. Kostin, director of the Voronezh power tools plant; and others spoke in the debates. They focused in detail on an analysis of the difficult economic situation in the country and made specific suggestions and proposals. Their main concern was the strengthening of the basic economic cell of production—the plant, the factory, and the association.

The center of gravity of many speeches was the idea of the need to use the whole arsenal of both economic and organizational measures in the conditions of transition to market relations so as to boost the interest of labor collectives in the end results of their work. Liaison with suppliers should be strengthened, and the centrifugal tendencies which impair these links and inflict losses on the entire economic complex of the country, and of the republics in particular, should be overcome.

Opinions were divided on a range of problems. Some spoke in favor of unlimited freedom in the economy, others, on the contrary, defended the administrative edict system, even demanding its temporary restoration. Economic interests were opposed to firm discipline. The need to take the implementation of management contracts and obligations under workers' control was discussed. A proposal to introduce a "moratorium" on strikes in all sectors and departments for a period of three years was also put forward.

Many speakers were in favor of concluding the new Union Treaty, but proposed that relevant economic agreements at the level of republics and individual regions be signed before its adoption. Otherwise there could be an even greater decline of production levels, both in the regions and in the country as a whole. Unemployment, poverty, speculation, and cuts in social programs—this is what such a situation could entail. The government of the Union and the republics and the labor collectives must not allow this.

Today the meeting is continuing its work.

Political Movements Discuss Union Treaty

PM1312163490 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 13 Dec 90 First Edition p 3

[TASS report: "How Are We All to Live in the Future?"]

[Text] It was not just the Communists at the CPSU Central Committee Plenum who discussed this question

on 11 December. At the same time Moscow was also the venue for a conference of leaders of other political movements to discuss the draft Union treaty. The fact that representatives from two dozen new public associations—ranging from liberals to monarchists—were effectively sitting at the same table as the ruling party is evidence not only of pluralism and the gathering momentum of the multiparty system. The problem that perestroika has placed at the center of events cannot fail to concern even those who by their ideological beliefs or program goals are a long way from our present troubles.

Summarizing the results of the discussion, B.I. Oleynik, deputy chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet of Nationalities and chairman of the union parliament commission for ties with public movements, who conducted the conference, noted that a document such as the draft Union treaty cannot be adopted without considering the opinion of the new political parties.

Parties Disagree on Treaty

LD1112200490 Moscow TASS in English 1936 GMT
11 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Boris Zvelev]

[Text] Moscow December 11 TASS—Representatives of political parties and movements of the country held a meeting at the Soviet parliament today.

The meeting, presided over by renowned Ukrainian writer Boris Oleynik, who is also USSR people's deputy and Soviet Communist Party Central Committee member, proved that it is difficult, if possible at all, to reach a compromise between various political forces.

Participants discussed a draft Union treaty. The meeting was attended by representatives of the Constitutional Democratic Party, the Marxist Workers Party, the Proletariat Dictatorship Party, the Monarchist Party, the Liberal Democratic Party and the all-union society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals". Differences between them often seemed insurmountable.

Liberal Democratic Party Chairman Vladimir Zhirinovskiy described the published draft union treaty as political experimenting. He said the time to sign a treaty has not come yet. First, it is necessary to put the country in order, as a "democratic state cannot be born in conditions of anarchy", Zhirinovskiy said.

The draft does not meet current realities, said Aleksandr Lapin, member of the political executive committee of the all-Union society "Unity for Leninism and Communist Ideals". He said some republics have chosen the road of capitalist development, noting the impossibility to unite in a single body "states having principally different class nature".

In spite of the fact that practically no positive assessments of the published draft Union treaty were voiced, the majority of participants favoured the preservation of the union of republics.

Official Interviewed on Parties' Registration

PM1001103391 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
3 Jan 91 Union Edition p 1

[Report by G. Alimov: "Return to Multiparty System; Registration of Political Parties and Public Associations Begins"]

[Excerpts] After seven decades, as of 1 January the country is returning to one of the unshakable norms of democracy: the free functioning of different political parties and movements in society. With the entry into force of the Law on Public Associations adopted by the USSR Supreme Soviet in October last year, we have, as it were, officially opened the multiparty era. A special service set up under the USSR Ministry of Justice is beginning registration of parties, movements, and organizations desiring all-Union, interrepublic, or interethnic status.

For the first time in the entire history of the Soviet state, citizens are guaranteed the freedom to form social organizations. The preamble to the law stresses that the right to form an association is the inalienable right of every individual and citizen. Article 16 stipulates that all parties are equal before the law.

Vladimir Zhbakov, the 44-year-old head of the department, which is known for the present as the "Department For Liaison With Public Associations," believes that the new work makes special demands of him and his colleagues. "It is not enough to be a good lawyer and state affairs expert," he said. "You also have to be able to grasp other aspects of the law."

The new service is starting from scratch. Vladimir Zhbakov believes that they will have to learn everything as they go along and so, in his opinion, qualities such as communicativeness and impartiality will not go amiss in his colleagues. Several of the 45 posts allocated for this service are held by people with no party affiliation. It cannot be ruled out that, in addition to Communists, people adhering to other beliefs could also be hired in the department. The head of the new service is a Communist himself, but he cannot take seriously the demand made by some representatives of social movements that CPSU membership be suspended. "Membership could be suspended," Vladimir Zhbakov said, "but how can you suspend beliefs? It is not even relevant anyway. Our contacts with parties and organizations will not be based on sympathy or antipathy. We are obliged to work strictly within the framework of the law..." [passage omitted]

"Public associations already existing or founded before 31 December last year may apply for registration any time during 1991," Vladimir Zhbakov explained. "All

others, i.e. those formed after 1 January, must submit their documents within one month."

The head of the registration service warned that it will not comment on draft statutes or offer consultation on documents. Applicants must submit all documents in their final form, he said. The Justice Ministry is obliged to adopt a well reasoned decision on each specific application within two months. This decision can only be contested in court.

Vladimir Zhbakov realizes that all kinds of conflicts may arise and that it is impossible to foresee every eventuality. He expects that some people will try to get commercial organizations through in the guise of public associations. In his opinion, disputes between parties over names cannot be ruled out either. The service has already received telephone calls from people strongly advising which groups to deal with and which not. "Listen to us, because we are genuine and not imposters."

"We do not intend to pay any attention to these disputes," my interlocutor said. "It is the concern of the parties and associations themselves. Let them straighten it out among themselves or take the matter to court."

So the Law on Public Associations is now in force. It depends on us whether we will be able to reconstruct a viable, balanced multiparty system. It is important for it to become a source of democracy and not a focus of tension in society.

'Marxist Platform' To Hold Conference 26-27 Jan

PM0801141191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 Jan 91 Second Edition p 3

[Report by A. Mayorova and E. Savenok: "We Invite Discussion"]

[Text] Can the present day afford theory, when the common tongue cries more and more loudly: "Enough talk, it is necessary to get down to business! All the same—" "There is nothing more practical than a good theory."

The issues—how to ensure the efficient development of the economy and at the same time prevent anyone from feeling a second-class human being; how to combine the country's movement toward the market with its move toward socialism, and whether these are indeed compatible; and what we should understand about the socialism we are seeking—were raised in a really uncompromising manner at the all-Union Conference of supporters of the Marxist Platform in the CPSU held recently. To make a feasible contribution to the theoretical development of Marxism—this was the task conference delegates set themselves by deciding to hold a scientific and practical conference on current economic problems early in 1991.

The conference will be held 26-27 January in Moscow in the "Orgres" firm's conference hall. It will examine, in

particular, the issue of the admissibility of various forms of ownership within the framework of socialism, the compatibility of market methods of price regulation and the decentralization of the economy's administration with socialism, and other questions.

Those wishing to take part in the conference from among persons standing on Marxist platform positions or sharing similar positions can send theses of their views in not more than two-three typed pages, together with requests for hotel accommodation, to the conference organizational committee no later than 12 January.

The organizational committee's postal address is: 140061, Moscow Oblast, Lytkarino City, 14 Sovetskaya Ulitsa, Box No. 55, Telephone 290-67-36, 551-41-09.

Free Labor Party Forms; Supports 'Businessmen'

LD1712171490 Moscow World Service in English
1200 GMT 17 Dec 90

[Text] The new Free Labor Party formed in the Soviet Union has as its objective the protection of the interests of businessmen. It will also represent those interests. The party is not big and does not intend to give very much attention to legislative activity. The party's political platform stresses the need to change the existing system, recognize many forms of privatization and also confiscate the property of the Soviet Communist Party. In the opinion of experts, practically all democratic parties and movements in the country are ready to uphold the interests of businessmen, therefore the Free Labour Party is unlikely to become a well known and influential organization in the immediate future.

Congress of Labor Collectives Union Opens

LD0812231890 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1530 GMT 8 Dec 90

[Video report by correspondent K. Kharlamov from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] As you know, the all-Union conference of heads of state enterprises ended yesterday. Today Moscow saw the opening of the constituent congress of a new public organization—the Union of Labor Collectives of the country.

[Kharlamov] Power to the councils of labor collectives! That could be the slogan of this congress. Economic and thus political power. Around 600 delegates—representatives of labor collectives from Russia, Belorussia, the Ukraine, Moldova, Kazakhstan, Latvia, and Armenia, plus more than 300 visitors to the congress—converged on the session hall of the Supreme Soviet of the Russian Federation to discuss and adopt the constituent and programmatic documents of the incipient union. Ways of developing the self-management of collectives in the present climate are to be discussed.

The deputies there also intend to table for discussion by the country's Supreme Soviet changes and amendments

to the laws on property and on the enterprise. The Union's plans include the creation of an aid fund to give labor collectives financial backing, and the organization of scientific-consultative and legal aid for its members.

The union is ready to cooperate with any state or political organization or movement which really does uphold the interests of working people and labor collectives.

On behalf of the country's leadership, Anatoliy Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet, greeted the congress participants.

Union Program Reported

PM1312142190 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Dec 90 Union Edition p 2

[I. Demchenko report: "Director, Labor Collective Council, and Ownership"]

[Text] The Union of Labor Collectives, which has only just been founded, has protested because state enterprise leaders have spoken on behalf of the labor collectives. Its constituent congress was held 8-10 December, right after the all-Union conference of enterprise leaders.

According to the union's program document, two facts prompted the normally rather sluggish labor collective councils to organize the congress. First, under the new legislation and starting in the new year, labor collective councils will no longer be a mandatory organ of enterprises' management (self-management). They may not even be elected. Second, the process of destatization of ownership, which began spontaneously and is fast developing, attaches great importance to the figure of "controller of property." This position is presently held, as a rule, by the enterprise leader. The congress participants hope that they have a chance to transfer this function to the labor collective as represented by its labor collective council.

Thus, the struggle for existence and for the right to control property provided the main topic of debate and of the resolution which was adopted. The document specifically makes demands that collectives at enterprises in all sectors without exception be given the right to opt for any form of ownership and that each working person be given the right to receive his share of profits regardless of the form of ownership. True enough, the mechanism for attaining these goals is still unclear.

It is equally unclear how the right of labor collective councils to exist as legal entities—adopted by a majority vote in favor—will be implemented in practice. Under the law, the status of legal entities is granted to organizations that own property and possess several other attributes, rather than just a seal as the congress participants obviously think. In this sense, the labor collective councils—much as they might like to—cannot expect to be on an equal footing with trade unions. True enough, proposals were made that membership dues should be

collected. However, it seems strange—to say the least—having to pay a membership due for belonging to one specific labor collective and none other. People usually receive wages for that.

Those assembled rejected a proposal to create a united strike committee that could, if the working people's demands were not met, bring all members of the Union of Labor Collectives out on strike. There were about 500 delegates taking part in the congress' work, representing various republics and regions. The congress was addressed by A. Lukyanov, chairman of the USSR Supreme Soviet.

We asked S. Andreyev, chairman of the Union of Leningrad Labor Collectives and member of the Council of Representatives of the Union of Labor Collectives which was elected 10 December, to comment on the outcome of the congress:

"We believe that the right to control property, delegated by the union parliament to the Council of Ministers and the latter, through its ministries, to the enterprise administrations, should be vested in the labor collectives. Let the collectives themselves decide the form of ownership at their production units and, in agreement with soviet organs at the appropriate level, switch from control to ownership. Including the hiring of enterprise administrations. Of course, if the collective so wishes, an enterprise can remain state-owned.

"Demands were made at the congress that enterprises' fixed production capital should be, in one way or another, divided between all working people. Fortunately, the congress succeeded in overcoming these moods. It is, however, necessary to understand well what has prompted them: There is much anxiety over the course of destatization now under way, as a result the nomenklatura, in addition to its old privileges, will be gaining new ones, becoming the de facto owner of property belonging to the whole people. Our union advocates that this pseudoprivatization be frozen until such time as a mechanism for the transformation of ownership is created and legislatively ratified."

Turkish Paper Interviews KGB Official

Second Installment

NC3011114090 *Istanbul MILLIYET in Turkish*
27 Nov 90 p 14

[Second of three installments of "exclusive" interview with General Aleksandr Nikolayevich Karbainov, chief of the KGB Public Relations Center, by MILLIYET correspondent Cenk Baslamis in Moscow; date not given; the first installment of this interview was published in the 30 November Soviet Union DAILY REPORT, page 52, column two, under the headline: "KGB Public Relations Chief Interviewed"]

[Excerpts] [Baslamis] Can you give me an example? Let's say you suspect someone of working against the Soviet

Union—what action is taken against him? Will he be placed under surveillance and his telephone tapped until his offense is proved? What will you do?

[Karbainov] I would first like to conclude what I was saying about the KGB's activities before replying to your question. The activities of the counterintelligence department are not limited to confronting agents. This department maintains security and protects the economy, particularly at the present time when we are opening to the outside world. At the same time, we do not want the counterintelligence department to obstruct the improvement of international relations. Of course, it is much easier to safeguard secrets with the help of restrictions. It is much more difficult to maintain security when millions of foreigners visit our country and many Soviet citizens travel abroad, but, nevertheless, we prefer this approach.

The counterintelligence department has a section charged with safeguarding the constitutional order in the Soviet Union. This section is tasked with obstructing acts of terrorism and attempts by individuals or groups to undermine state order in the Soviet Union by force. We do not now regard someone who announces at the top of his voice that he hates the Soviet state as having committed a crime. We are not concerned with such people. Everyone has the right to express his opinion. However, if such a person attends a meeting and calls for taking up arms to undermine the regime, then we must respond. We launch an investigation to determine whether such a call is empty talk or whether it is accompanied by actions that could threaten the constitutional order.

Yes, we are concerned with such people and organizations. Furthermore, we are convinced that ours is a very humanitarian approach, because it would be unjustified if we immediately arrested someone solely because he called for the people to take up arms. We need more than words—we need evidence—to prove that such a person is prepared to take action. [passage omitted]

In addition to the counterintelligence department, the KGB has a department which provides the the government with the means of secret communication. There is also a cryptographic department, which serves the Ministry of Foreign Affairs and other establishments. The KGB also has a department for the border guards and a department for support services. The public relations center is another of the KGB's departments. This is the structure of the KGB.

The work the KGB carries out in connection with groups or individuals is not much different from the work carried out in other countries in the same direction. When we receive information that an individual is trying to disrupt the constitutional order or is prepared to carry out an act of violence or is engaged in espionage activities, we place such a person under surveillance. We use

covert methods in this kind of work. We tap the telephones of such people. This, however, is done with the consent of the procurator general's office. [passage omitted]

I wish to add that the KGB also has an investigations department, which is located in Lefortovo. Suspects are held in the detention center in Lefortovo. We are currently handling a number of cases related to acts of espionage and the activities of organized crime groups. Meanwhile, in accordance with a request from the procurator general's office, our investigators are taking part in the investigations carried out in connection with ethnic developments. We do not carry out inquiries in that regard as it is the procuracy which is responsible for such investigations by law. Nevertheless, we have the right to use the services of the officials who carry out investigations. You will recall the shooting incident that took place in Red Square on 7 November. The person who was responsible for this act of terrorism was arrested and has been charged. KGB officials are investigating this incident. I believe that this answers your question.

[Baslamis] Has any difficulty been encountered during the interrogation of the person who fired at Gorbachev in Red Square? He claimed that he was "driven to it by his living conditions and joblessness." He said: "Therefore, I decided to kill Gorbachev." Did he confess this when he was arrested or after a certain period of time?

[Karbainov] The investigation is being carried out in camera. He has made a full confession. The method of interrogation used at present is very different from that used in the 1930's. Class differences justified the methods that were used in the past. Confessions were forcibly extracted from suspects. However, officials now fully comply with the laws in this regard. [passage omitted]

The constitutional article on anti-Soviet propaganda was amended in 1989. This has given rise to the following question: "Individuals who engaged in antistate activities were placed under surveillance in the 1970's. How can you continue such surveillance now?" It is difficult to justify this question because what the KGB did then was to obey a law that was passed by the Supreme Soviet. These laws were enacted by the Supreme Soviet and not by the KGB. We had to act in accordance with the law. However, the political situation has changed. We too condemn this law. I am convinced that we should look for those who bear responsibility for this state of affairs not within the KGB but within the administrative organs of the state. The conflict between obeying instructions and obeying one's conscience has been a problem since time immemorial. When executing an order, a civilized person must act in accordance with his conscience. The question concerns a conflict between obeying the law and obeying one's conscience. My reply to questions on this matter is as follows: It is unfair to hold the KGB responsible for the oppression that existed in the past. It is the former state officials who should be held responsible.

Final Installment

NC3011221690 Istanbul MILLIYET
in Turkish 28 Nov 90 p 14

[Final installment of interview with General Aleksandr Nikolayevich Karbainov, chief of the KGB Public Relations Center, by MILLIYET correspondent Cenk Baslamis in Moscow; date not given]

[Excerpts] [Baslamis] The KGB recently began to establish relations and cooperation with Western intelligence organizations. Has it established relations with the Turkish intelligence organization?

[Karbainov] I have not heard of such relations thus far. However, we probably have common interests in principle.

[Baslamis] Do you have figures that you can disclose in connection with the KGB? For example, in connection with its budget or with the number of people who work for the KGB. Furthermore, what are the privileges of the KGB officials in the course of their duties?

[Karbainov] We have received many questions in connection with the budget. Had it been in my hands, I would have disclosed the figures in the KGB budget. I would have gone into the street and screamed. However, I have no right to do so. This is a state secret. It is not a KGB secret. It is a matter within the authority of the parliament. Nevertheless, I believe that the budget figures will be disclosed in the near future. That is how I think it should be. The wall of secrecy will be brought down. This will give our people an opportunity to see that our budget is very much smaller than the budget of the U.S. intelligence organization, for example. The level of the work we do is approximately the same as the level of the work carried out by the U.S. intelligence organization. However, they have greater material resources.

Regarding the question of wages, well, an average FBI official, who is regarded as an experienced employee, is paid nearly \$5,000 a month. A KGB official, who is at the same level, for example, Aleksandr Grigoryevich, who is considered an experienced and high-ranking official and who is also here at this moment, is paid 350 rubles (nearly 1.5 million Turkish lira). He also receives an allowance for his rank. That is about 100 rubles (450,000 Turkish lira). We now have 450 rubles on the one hand and \$5,000 on the other. A dollar is worth 20 rubles on the black market today. Considering all this, we can say that Aleksandr Grigor'yevich is paid \$20 or \$25 a month. This is 200 times less than what an FBI official is paid. These are authentic figures.

We have also been asked many questions about the number of cadres. The parliament has authorized us to disclose the number of border guards, which is 18,000. Our borders, on the other hand, are 68,000 km long.

Regarding the question of privileges, I have already said that we do not have stores of our own. Unfortunately, we do not. We would have been very happy if we had such

stores, particularly now. You are aware of the state of our shops—they are empty. If we need a pair of shoes, we wonder where we can buy them. [passage omitted]

Sometimes we have to make official visits to other cities. We go across to the Aeroflot travel office and stand in line. Buying tickets to a movie or theater is no different. Because of the mafia in the Bolshoi Theater, even we cannot attend its performances. Aleksandr Grigoryevich has not been able to attend a performance at the Bolshoi Theater since 1983.

[Baslamis] As you have explained, the KGB is taking steps toward glasnost and reforms. Nevertheless, the KGB still has a horrible image in the eyes of the man in the street. Will it not be difficult to change this image? Are you not finding this endeavor difficult?

[Karbainov] You are right. The human mind resists change. A large number of people were affected by the oppression during the Stalin era. The present generation has not forgotten this. Many people's relatives were oppressed then. The wounds of that era are still fresh. That is why the KGB's work creates fear and a lack of confidence. We must open ourselves to the people either through the mass media organs or through direct meetings. Meanwhile, we must inform the people on two matters. First, we must tell them what we are doing and explain why they need us. Second, we must explain our views to them as human beings. A law or a decree cannot change what has been done. We have to tell the truth and remain sincere if we wish to gain the confidence of the people. In view of this, we are trying to explain the work of the KGB as much as possible with the help of the mass media. [passage omitted]

We do not want only to open a window in the wall which surrounds the KGB. We want to bring down the entire wall. However, we must achieve this in a conscious way. That the secret services have their laws is common knowledge. Secrecy is the most important factor in these laws. Unless secrecy is maintained in our activities, then the secret service will lose its character. It will then be very difficult to wage a struggle against the secret services of other countries. In view of this, establishing a balance between secrecy and openness is very important. We always consider this conflicting point in our work. We want our work and its outcome to be publicized. However, the concrete information on our operations must be kept secret.

[Baslamis] We asked for an appointment with the KGB eight months ago. Something must have gone wrong. There must have been a problem either on your side or on our side. Which one was it?

[Karbainov] I have not been able to find out what has gone on. Something like this should not have happened. Our center has been operating since April 1990. I have met with foreign correspondents during this period of time. Perhaps our bureaucracy should be blamed. Your request may have been lost. You did not renew your request. Nevertheless, we still apologize. I will try to find

out. I was informed about your request on 5 November when I had just returned from a vacation. I checked the calendar and set the day we should meet. We want to meet with all the correspondents who are accredited to Moscow. We insist that both the Soviet and the foreign countries be accredited to the public relations center. We will hold news conferences on the different aspects of our activities. The correspondents will be able to use their accreditation cards to attend these meetings. That is, the correspondents will be able to come here to ask their questions whenever they wish to do so.

[Baslamis] Secret services must comply with a number of principles on secrecy. However, can you explain in general terms, for example, who is investigated or followed by the KGB?

[Karbainov] First, I wish to say a few words about KGB's activities. The KGB is not opposed to anyone. It works to promote the interests of the community. In view of this, we have different activities. A rapprochement is happening in the world. Economic, political, and humanitarian relations are being established. These are positive and civilized developments. Nevertheless, while moving toward the concept of rapprochement, each and every state always considers the level of its security. In view of this, intelligence is a very important way to consolidate security. Intelligence services will continue to exist as long as states exist in the world. I met with Colby, former chief of the CIA, sometime ago. We exchanged views. He fully shared my opinion.

Another task of the intelligence services is the removal of the widespread violence in the world. As in the case of terrorist activities, drug trafficking is also regarded as a kind of violence. Intelligence services contribute to the struggle against acts of violence. We have received understanding from the intelligence services of foreign countries in that domain. I believe that the intelligence organizations will establish links in this field to coordinate their effort in this common struggle in the future. I will describe this as a very humanitarian duty. We also have a counterintelligence establishment. State, military, trade, and scientific secrets will exist as long as the state exists. If there are secrets, then there will be interest in them. Measures should be taken against this interest. This is done by the counterintelligence department. We have exposed more than 30 agents during the past five or seven years. All of them were Soviet citizens who worked for foreign intelligence services. There were both important and unimportant agents among them.

Petrovskiy, UN Environment Official Hold Talks
*LD101224290 Moscow TASS in English 2126 GMT
10 Dec 90*

[Text] Moscow December 10 TASS—Soviet Deputy Prime Minister Vitaliy Doguzhiyev, heading the Soviet Government's State commission for emergency situations, today met executive director of the United Nations Environment Programme (UNEP) Mostafa Tolba [spelling as received].

They discussed cooperation with the UNEP in the field of environmental protection, especially in cleaning the aftermath of the Chernobyl disaster and ecological revival of the Aral Sea area.

Later in the day, Tolba met Soviet Deputy foreign Minister Vladimir Petrovskiy, chairman of the interdepartmental commission at the Soviet foreign ministry for foreign political and international legal issues of cooperation in environmental protection.

Petrovskiy conveyed a message by Soviet Foreign Minister Eduard Shevardnadze, suggesting the development of cooperation between the Soviet Union and the UNEP. It is necessary to increase practical results of such cooperation, the message reads.

They focused on specific aspects of practical interaction between the Soviet Union and the UNEP in resolving problems important for the Soviet Union, including cleaning the aftermath of the Chernobyl disaster, the Aral crisis and the revival of Lake Baykal.

They agreed that the UNEP will coordinate efforts by all the sides concerned in working out a plan for ecological revival of the Black and Aral Seas, the Danube, the Volga and other rivers in the basin.

They discussed the idea to set up a centre for urgent ecological assistance at the United Nations and organise ecological space monitoring of the earth from space.

They also discussed preparation for the 1992 U.N. Conference on the Environment. The Soviet president proposed holding a summit conference. The sides agreed that the conference might result in signing two international conventions—on the climate and on biological diversity.

The Soviet side noted the need to supplement efforts by government of states with a broad spectrum of public movements and organisations, involved in environmental protection.

Gorbachev Congratulates Medical Academy

*PM1912160990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
14 Dec 90 Second Edition p 1*

[Message from USSR President Gorbachev to associates and students of Moscow's I.M. Sechenov Medical Academy on its 225th anniversary; date not given]

[Text] To the Collective of Associates and Students of the Moscow I.M. Sechenov Medical Academy.

Dear Comrades!

I cordially congratulate you on the 225th anniversary of Moscow's I.M. Sechenov Medical Academy, which is one of our country's leading and most authoritative centers for training medical cadres. Academy graduates have won appreciation and respect for their high standard of professionalism and their selfless work on behalf

of people. Outstanding scientists, who have brought credit to Soviet medicine, have worked within the academy walls.

The academy's contribution to developing international cooperation and training specialists from foreign countries is universally recognized.

I wish you further success in your scientific and practical work for the good of our country.

[Signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev.

Two Soviet Intelligence Agents Receive Award

*LD0612160790 Moscow World Service
in Russian 1044 GMT 6 Dec 90*

[Text] Two Soviet intelligence agents, (Irina Alimova) and (Samuil Khamzin), have been presented with government awards. In the 1960's and later, they worked in one of the Southeast Asian countries. According to the cover story which was compiled for them, they registered a marriage there, which, as it happens, proved to be a happy one. Khamzin later worked in Hong Kong, in Britain, and in the United States. One of the operations that the marriage partners carried out made it possible in those years to find out about plans to build atomic bombs in Israel and the Republic of South Africa, and plans for new weapons. The couple now lives in Moscow.

Leaders Sign Former Abkhaz CP Chief's Obituary

*PM2112163190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Dec 90 Second Edition p 6*

[Obituary of former Abkhaz Oblast Party Committee First Secretary B.V. Adleyba]

[Excerpts] Boris Viktorovich Adleyba, USSR people's deputy, personal pensioner of union status, and former first secretary of the Abkhaz Georgian Communist Party Oblast Committee, died suddenly on 17 December 1990 at the age of 60.

B.V. Adleyba was born on 15 July 1931 in Sukhumi, Abkhaz Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic. [passage omitted]

[Signed] V.A. Ivashko, A.S. Dzasokhov, G.V. Semenova, Ye.S. Stroyev, O.S. Shenin, G.I. Yanayev, O.D. Baklanov, B.V. Gidasov, A.N. Girenko, V.A. Kuptsov, Yu.A. Manayenkov, V.M. Falin, A.I. Lukyanov, A.A. Margiani, V.F. Khishba, T.S. Khakhva, V.G. Ardzinba, V.T. Mikanba, L. Ya. Khaburzaniya, and B.V. Shinkuba.

Figures for Various Parties' Membership Given

PM1712160190 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 13 Dec 90 First Edition p 4

[Unattributed response to reader's letter under the rubric "Briefing for Readers": "Parties Great and Small"—first two paragraphs are reader's letter]

[Text] Almost every day now some new party is born. Would it be possible to give membership figures at least for those parties mentioned most frequently in the press?

[Signed] N. Vasin

Here is the picture as of 1 October:

Party:	Number of members:
CPSU	17,742,634
Democratic Party of Russia (DPR)	25,300
Russian Christian Democratic Movement (RKhDD)	around 15,000
Social Democratic Party of Russia (SDPR)	around 4,000
Liberal Democratic Party of the Soviet Union (LDP)	around 3,000
Marxist Workers Party (MRP)	around 300
Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists (KAS)	up to 400
Party of Constitutional Democrats (PKD)	up to 100
Democratic Party of the Soviet Union (DPSS)	over 1,500
Democratic Union (DS)	around 600
Republican Party of the Russian Federation (RPR)	around 1,000 (in Moscow)

The information is based on the statistics provided by the credentials commissions at the relevant parties' congresses and is also from other sources. We should point out, of course, that there may be further clarification here.

The dynamics of the various parties' membership is very fluid. Furthermore, it is no secret that in various interviews and speeches some leaders of the new parties sometimes deliberately overstate their membership. And there are parties where the institution of membership has not been clearly defined. Nevertheless, it is obvious that the number of members of the leading party in our society, which is what the CPSU has been for many decades now, is far in excess of the new political organizations that are coming into being.

Unemployment Problems, Solutions Pondered

PM1101100191 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 5 Jan 91 First Edition p 2

[Article by Professor V. Vidyapin, rector of Moscow's G.V. Plekhanov Institute of the National Economy, and

V. Kuzmin, lecturer at Moscow's G.V. Plekhanov Institute of the National Economy, under the rubric "The Market and Its Surprises": "The Specter of Unemployment Benefits"]

[Text] What is the real scale of possible unemployment resulting from the transition to a market system? Perhaps no one knows the answer to this question at present. Just as no one apparently has any intention of studying the social structure of unemployment and the conditions in which it will develop. The government program assumes that 10 million working people will be released from their jobs during a gradual transition (the moderate-radical option) to a market economy, while the "500 days" program (the radical option) considerably underestimates the extent of unemployment (just over 6 million at the start of 1991 and approximately 12 million at the start of 1992).

But, in our view, these assumptions are too optimistic, because they fail to take account of the features of the situation regarding the use of labor resources that has developed over the last 15-20 years.

First, there have been 5-6 million unemployed in our country for many years: Half of this number is accounted for by regions with surplus manpower (Central Asia, Kazakhstan, the North Caucasus, and the Transcaucasus). Second, virtually every enterprise, organization, and body of management in the national economy has working people at all levels permanently on the payroll who are, in fact, supernumeraries. The certification of workplaces, the experience of switching to leasehold and collective contract systems, and the transformation of state enterprises into cooperatives have all shown this to be the case with approximately one in five to one in seven working people.

Even without switching to a market system, elementary regulation of the use of manpower would result in 22-28 million people being released from their jobs, including 5-7 million leading workers and specialists. A market system will do this quickly and decisively.

Third, more than 4 million graduates from secondary schools, vocational and technical schools, technical colleges, and higher education establishments enter employment every year, as well as people who have completed their compulsory army service. They will now be joined by servicemen transferred to the reserve as a result of cuts in the Armed Forces.

Fourth, the complication of interethnic relations has produced a flood of refugees—moving in the direction of the Russian Federation in particular—who will also be joining the army of unemployed.

This means that in the first years of the transition to a market system, the labor market's resources could total 31-38 million people. Even if the national economy were to shed 11.5 million people by giving them early retirement and a further 8 million people of pensionable age (who are still working at present), it would still be left

with 11.5-18.5 million unemployed. Unemployment will be overcome not by transferring people from one (eliminated) workplace to another (currently available), which, if it comes to the worst, will require retraining, but by creating new employment. Going on the basis that the average workplace costs 30,000 rubles [R], as much as R350-550 billion in capital investment will be needed to create new jobs.

Discussion of employment and unemployment problems by the USSR Supreme Soviet and the Union republics' supreme soviets, the stand taken on these matters by state bodies and trade unions, and discussions in the press show that many either do not fully understand the nature of the problem or underestimate its complexity and political cost.

Meanwhile, the governments of all civilized countries have long raised and tackled the problem of ensuring virtually full employment for everyone who wants to work. In the late seventies, for example, the EEC countries spent approximately \$350 billion a year on resolving employment and unemployment problems, which is equivalent to the GNP of countries like Belgium and the Netherlands put together....

In short, it is obvious that resolving the problems of employment and unemployment in our country during its transition to a market system is going to come up against a number of objective difficulties. We must also realize that no unemployment benefits, however high, can be a substitute for work itself and that basically working people do not need charity—whoever it may come from—but real work, the absence of which “dehumanizes” them. In the late seventies the FRG conducted an opinion poll among working people with jobs, asking them about possible ways to eliminate unemployment. It showed that almost two-thirds of the respondents believed that this should be done by finding work for the unemployed and, in the event of there being no new jobs, expressed willingness to have their own working day cut—and hence their wages also—so that there should be work for the unemployed.

How are we to progress toward a market system, the need for which is understood by most of the population? As far as finding work for young people is concerned, we believe that all enterprises and organizations should be under a legal obligation—whatever their particular form of ownership—to create annual vacancies accounting for three percent of their total workforce (this is approximately equivalent to natural wastage in manpower). Generally speaking, local soviets should be responsible for organizing the retraining and placing of people in new work. It would be advisable to have the costs covered by the state (in the form of unemployment benefits) and by enterprises releasing working people and placing them in new jobs (in the form of compensation for retraining in equal proportions).

We think that retraining and improving the qualifications of working people released from their jobs should

primarily be the responsibility of vocational and technical schools, technical colleges, and higher education establishments in specially created departments (faculties) at the request of employment bodies in return for a fee, the size of which will be established in an agreement between them.

When tackling the problem of compensating this expenditure, it would not hurt to consider France's experience: Regardless of their form of ownership, enterprises and organizations contribute some of their resources to a special fund, the size of which is in proportion to the payroll of the enterprise or organization in question. This method is also used in Poland, incidentally. The special fund comprises 2.5 percent of the payroll.

The fact is that different enterprises spend substantially different amounts on training cadres and improving their qualifications but have equal access to all categories of labor resources. Cooperatives, for example, spend absolutely nothing in this respect but are nevertheless able to secure the very best cadres. The French approach completely rules out this kind of “defect” and makes it possible to levy payment not only for manpower but also for its qualifications, which are directly linked to the amount of wages paid.

In our view, enrollment for day courses at higher education establishments and technical colleges (not teacher training colleges or higher cultural institutes) should be sharply reduced (by 20-30 percent) in the near future, without changing the amount of finance these institutions receive; they should then be geared to the task of retraining cadres in a second vocation. This would ease tension in the placement of young specialists and people affected by staff cuts during the transition to a market economy. Those undergoing retraining could be given a stipend equivalent to unemployment benefits. This step would remove the problem of finding work for 1-1.5 million laid-off specialists over the next 2-3 years.

Analyzing the process of new leaders forming new bodies of government, you unfortunately become convinced that, despite being new, they often work along the old lines: First a ministry (or committee) is created, then a minister (or chairman) is appointed, then the main portfolios are handed out, and only then is any thought given to what their specific responsibilities will be (although it should all be the other way around: the problems, the methods of resolving them, the structure, and the cadres required). All this is done on the basis of the sadly renowned principle: Everything said and done here before us is to be scorned and forgotten—we will make “a fresh start”....

The problems of the labor market, employment, and unemployment that we have covered—although by no means in full—require a basic redistribution of functions, tasks, rights, responsibilities, and material and financial resources between bodies of authority at the center and at local level responsible for creating normal conditions for the reproduction of the population and

the labor force. Bodies set up where people live and work must be given maximum responsibility for these tasks and provided with the facilities they need. Higher authorities should only be responsible for matters beyond the powers of lower-ranking bodies, and also for the task of "levelling" these conditions with the use of their own resources.

Aviation Official Outlines Aeroflot Plans

LD2112112290 Moscow TASS in English 1111 GMT
21 Dec 90

[By TASS correspondent Leonid Timofeyev]

[Text] Moscow December 21 TASS—A total of 25 million people were unable to fly the Soviet Aeroflot carrier because tickets were unavailable. First Deputy Aviation Minister Aleksey Goryashko told reporters on Thursday.

He blamed the unsatisfied demand for air-travel on the lack of fuel, engines and new types of planes.

Before the end of the year aeroflot will have carried 137.1 million passengers, Goryashko said.

Over the past five years an average of 1.39 planes crashed per one million of flights, he revealed. The average figure for the international civil aviation organisation was 1.65.

There were 27 hijack attempts in 1990 in the Soviet Union. Nine were successful, but the air pirates actually carried had arms or bombs in only two cases, he said.

The Civil Aviation Ministry is authorising customs services and training personnel to avert such incidents, he said.

The government's decision to change the rouble-dollar exchange rate is forcing the air carrier to increase fares. The increase will depend on compensations Aeroflot hopes to get from the government, he said.

However, prices won't be raised on January 1, since the issue is still under discussion, he said.

In 1991, the company plans to give more independence to local branches. Such independent air carriers as "The Lithuanian Airlines", "Bashkirian Airlines" and "Kamchatavia" have already been set up. However, Aeroflot will remain the major carrier for the near future, he said.

Health Collegium Discusses Plague Prevention

PM1012131990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
4 Dec 90 Union Edition p 6

[S. Tutorskaya report: "You Could Catch the Plague; the Infection is Real, But Is the Injection?"]

[Text] The USSR Health Ministry has discussed measures needed to forecast and prevent the danger of infection.

Epidemiologists had long intended to raise the question of the plague at a USSR Health Ministry Collegium sitting. The fact of the matter is that three people in our country have died of the plague since the beginning of the year, and a total of five people have contracted the disease this year.

There is a cure for the plague! So why have three people died of the plague in Kazakhstan? Because physicians have forgotten how to recognise the symptoms of the disease. They treated the effects but not the cause: The correct diagnosis was made too late in every case.

Just two years ago, information on the plague was classified. It was as if the problem did not exist. That is why special courses at institutes and articles in scientific journals have disappeared. But we all live on the same planet, and many terrible diseases have not yet disappeared. The recent introduction of cholera to our country from India and Iraq is an alarming reminder of this.

Infection with the plague (in its pulmonary form it is transmitted through coughing and the spray of saliva) and its serious progression are such that the disease has long been incorporated into popular proverbs and sayings. It is no accident that AIDS is called the plague of the 20th century. The discussion at the USSR Health Ministry Collegium sitting was urgently needed.

What exactly do we have at our disposal? A network of antiplague centers (29 in all), approximately 190 units working to prevent infection, and six research institutes headed by the Saratov Institute. We have had a system for monitoring and forecasting the situation since 1897. Almost 100 years. But, at present, half of all antiplague centers work in intolerable conditions and are poorly equipped.

The outlook for the future is not bright: Our centers of infection, where the disease is mainly spread by small rodents and fleas, are also troubled areas. They are: Central Asia, several oblasts in Kazakhstan, Tuva, the Caspian region, the North Caucasus, and the Transcaucasus. When the antiplague service finds animals carrying the plague bacillus, all rodents and fleas are destroyed. There is as yet no other way of preventing an epidemic in the world.

Even plowing the land in areas where the plague naturally occurs increases the danger of humans and animals becoming infected, and the same thing happens with mineral extraction.

So why not evacuate everyone from these risk areas, some readers will ask. Apart from the fact that this plan is unrealistic—many regions where infection is smoldering are densely populated, and Moscow, for example, is in an area of tick-borne encephalitis—the infection itself will nevertheless remain, which means that the same work will have to be done by specialists from the antiplague service.

This front—which, until recently, was unseen by the outside world—is being held with difficulty. We need “weapons”: Modern laboratory equipment, like that seen by our specialists in India, for example. We need direct working links with units of military physicians and infectious diseases specialists. The collegium sitting also said that we need to galvanize the work of research institutes, bring their research topics right out “into the open,” and print articles for physicians in specialized journals and a list of do’s and don’t’s for the population. There must be stricter hygiene measures.

An antiplague service must be maintained at union level: There must be unified methods, a unified approach, and accurate information.

The fact that local authorities in Dagestan, Astrakhan, Guryev, and the Kara-Kalpak Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic do not devote proper attention to the state of their antiplague centers, despite the adverse epidemic forecast in these regions, is completely mystifying. If properly equipped, the centers to which I am referring could (and should!) prevent not only the plague from spreading, but also other serious diseases from being transmitted to humans by animals.

None of this can be put off until tomorrow. A plague epidemic did not break out after the Armenian earthquake only thanks to the joint efforts by specialists from Saratov’s Mikrob Institute, Armenian infectious diseases specialists, and their colleagues from Volgograd, Rostov, and Stavropol.

... As I left the collegium sitting, I thought of something I had seen recently: Some young boys in Moscow banging sticks hard against a garbage container—and rats running out. Not a very pretty picture, but one which I had seen long ago, after the war, and had not expected to see again....

MVD Briefing Stresses Militia Shortage

*PM2112121990 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 19 Dec 90 Second Edition p 3*

[S. Shevtsov report: “Briefing at USSR Ministry of Internal Affairs: Militia Needs Help”]

[Text] Maybe the person who coined the current ironic catchphrase “Life has become more fun!” is partly right. But the fact that life has now become much more dangerous is certainly indisputable.

So compared with last year there has been a sharp rise in property crimes (over 60 percent of all those recorded), serious crimes (15 percent), and crimes on public transport (26 percent), and as before it is not safe for citizens to be on the streets, especially after dark.

At the same time, almost 60 percent more cases of large-scale and very large-scale speculation have been revealed. Also, in the light of the complex consumer market situation the country’s Ministry of Internal

Affairs [MVD] has implemented a series of major targeted measures to uncover and suppress crimes and abuses in this sphere in a timely fashion.

BKhSS [Struggle Against Embezzlement of Socialist Property and Speculation] staffers have taken control of the receipt of humanitarian aid into the country (as of today 8,110 tonnes of this freight have crossed the border) and have already exposed several crimes: Packages were stolen at a Vladimir school, a container addressed to the Moscow Danilov Monastery disappeared without trace, and a group from the Red Cross and Red Crescent Society that was appropriating packages was uncovered...

There was specific talk at the briefing about the problems of our law-enforcement organs. The country has one patrolman for between 2,500 and 3,500 city dwellers, whereas in the most developed countries this figure does not exceed 1,000. And this is accompanied by the very meager provision of technical equipment for our patrolmen! We should add to this the diversion of major militia forces “to service” the rallies and demonstrations that are now so frequent and the endless waiting lines (in Moscow alone up to 1,200 militiamen a day have been “used” at wine outlets and up to 50 patrolmen at the waiting line at the Children’s World department store in Dzerzhinskiy Square.

For this reason the following was heard at the briefing: To enable the guardians of order to work more effectively we must have an additional 30 special-purpose militia detachments, increase the number of patrolmen by 100,000 and the number of investigators by 21,000, and to equip the law and order organs with modern technology.

To sum up Major General of the Militia Ye. Lagoda, first deputy chief of the USSR MVD Criminal Investigation Main Administration, says: “No matter how we train or motivate militia personnel, they are physically unable to cope with this huge crime wave.”

Azerbaijani Hijacker Arrested in Tbilisi

*NC1312135990 Baku Domestic Service in Azeri
1700 GMT 12 Dec 90*

[Text] The Azerbaijan Soviet Socialist Republic KGB headquarters told an Azerinform correspondent that Rauf Abbasoglu Mursalov attempted to hijack a YAK-40 airliner flying from Baku foreign country via Tbilisi on 11 December. Mursalov, born in 1959, who is a teacher at the Baku branch of the specialized technical and vocational training institute, also teaches at the [words indistinct] institute. As the plane took off from Baku airport, Mursalov gave the steward a note for the pilot demanding that the aircraft change its route and fly to Turkey. He warned that he had an explosive and would blow up the airplane if his demand was not met.

The crew persuaded Mursalov that they had to land in Tbilisi to refuel and settle a number of matters in order

to fly to Turkey. Mursalov was arrested when the aircraft landed at Tbilisi airport. The incident is under investigation.

1976-1990 Attempted Hijackings Examined

91UN0465A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA
in Russian 9 Dec 90 p 1

[Article by S. Pluzhnikov: "KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Dossier": "Under the 'Alarm Bell' Plan"]

[Text]The Ministry of Internal Affairs [MVD] and the KGB have acted in more than 50 cases to neutralize our air defectors.

1976. On 23 September, second pilot Zasimov flew his AN-24 without passengers from Pushkinskiy Rayon of the Azerbaijan SSR [Soviet Socialist Republic] to Iran. Two days later, he was returned to the USSR by the Iranian authorities.

1977. Two attempts and two hijackings from the northwestern area of the USSR occurred. Sosnovskiy was sentenced to four years by a Swedish court. Two repeat offenders, Sheludko and Zagirnyak, were returned to the USSR by the Finnish authorities.

1978. Six attempted hijackings, mainly from the southern part of the country. Fire exchanged. Muscovite Afonin demanded that the crew change course to reach Sweden. Having been turned down, he fired 11 times at the cabin door and partitions of the plane. The criminal was apprehended after landing in Parnu. One hour after an AN-24 took off from Groznyy, passenger Makhayev wounded flight engineer Ryadchenko in the leg with a pistol, and shot himself after the plane landed in Makhachkala.

1979. On 1 April student Vyanshas attempted to hijack a YAK-40 from Simferopol to Turkey, threatening to set off an explosion. After he was apprehended, they found on him a doll, a time relay from a washing machine, and a compass. Two criminals were shot in the course of attempted hijackings in Novokuznetsk and Anadyr.

1980. Three attempted hijackings. The terrorists were under 20.

1981. No attempts to commandeer and hijack planes were made.

1982. After a TU-154 landed in Leningrad, a 22-year-old passenger gave a note to a stewardess with a demand to deliver to the plane two suitcases with 250,000 rubles in each and a threat to shoot the entire crew, but was apprehended without difficulty by the militia who came to the rescue. On 7 November, an AN-24 which took off from Novorossiysk landed in the airport of the Turkish city of Sinop after an explosion threat. Three hijackers were sentenced by a Turkish court to more than nine years of imprisonment.

1983. Three attempts and one hijacking. During the seizure of a TU-134 on 18 November by seven terrorists, three members of the crew were killed. Three criminals were mortally wounded after a landing in Tbilisi and an exchange of fire.

1984. There were no attempts to commandeer and hijack planes.

1985. One attempted seizure and one hijacking. In the first case, the criminals surrendered, and once again only a compass was found on them. A hijacker—second pilot of an AN-24—succeeded in landing his plane with 37 passengers on board on the territory of China.

1986. On 20 September, two armed servicemen, drug addicts, killed two passengers after seizing a TU-134 in Ufa.

1987. One hijacking of an AN-2 to Sweden. Svistunov, 24, was given a suspended sentence of two years by a Swedish court. Artist Khatskevich was apprehended during an attempt to hijack a TU-134 from Minsk to Paris. A court-appointed psychiatric evaluation found him to be irresponsible.

1988. The armed Ovechkin family seized a TU-154.

1989. Four attempted hijackings. Two out of four hijackers were found to be mentally ill.

1990. Nine hijackings and 16 attempts to commandeer planes have occurred. The following have been confiscated from the criminals: a vial containing a white liquid, a kitchen knife and a hammer, a can, and a small ax... despite all of them threatening to blow up the planes. A powerful explosive device was confiscated only from Gerasimov, who attempted to hijack a TU-154 from Leningrad to Stockholm.

Our Commentary

Who were those hijackers of ours? Factual materials assiduously collected by USSR MVD employees show that they were either youths (between 17 and 25), repeat offenders, or mentally ill individuals. A majority had neither explosives nor weapons on them. Almost nobody among them made political demands but... All surviving air defectors talked in the course of investigations and court proceedings about empty store shelves, lining up for everything, and their hopeless existence; all of them stubbornly believed that OVER THERE, where they flew as butterflies into the flame, the people live better...

What is the explanation for a flare-up of hijackings in 1990? It was preordained by a tremendous number of anonymous calls reporting bombs left in airline luggage and explosives in check-rooms... Last year, 80 (!) such reports were logged. Since 1 January 1990, 34 reports have been registered. Have "jokers" switched from words to deeds?

Representatives of the militia and Aeroflot blame the press in unison. They are mistaken on one point when

they argue that events associated with hijackings should not be covered in detail. However, they are right on another point—glasnost has made many people ponder the absurdity of Soviet existence and robbed them of their belief in the soon-to-come bright future. Should the newspapers and television be blamed for this? In the coming half-year, journalists will recount in detail the trials of hijackers of the summer and fall of 1990 in an effort to reduce the number of hijackings per capita. However, there are no prospects of our life changing for the better soon.

Stop. Who is responsible for ensuring that nothing explodes or is fired in flight? The inspection service of airports. As it turns out, it is not that large in our country: 4,500 militiamen and 5,000 Aeroflot employees. It is even more lamentable that it is poorly equipped and low-paid.

In the course of "Alarm Bell" operations, captains of aircraft who received a note "to fly to Helsinki" or someplace else abroad contacted "the ground" and took an interest in how the luggage had been inspected. Prior to November 1990, pilots were given assurances orally or not at all that inspections were excellent. Now, the USSR MVD and Ministry of Civil Aviation have "generated" a new joint instruction: Special-control employees in airports have the duty of filling out preflight inspection cards certifying that there are no explosives or weapons on board. However, at present the pilots distrust the signed statements of controllers as much as they previously disbelieved their word, and the pilots are right. There are many ways to carry bombs and explosive devices onto an aircraft bypassing inspections (for obvious reasons, I am not going to discuss them). Numerous experiments carried out by the militia jointly with the KGB in Moscow, Dnepropetrovsk, and other cities have proven this. To be sure, the Ministry of Civil Aviation still cherishes the hope of gaining complete control and creating a security superservice. Its draft organization has even been developed. Specialists on fighting air terrorism have set out to mark all the powder available in the world able to detect it behind an X-ray-impenetrable screen. Our people are also "in favor." However, how much time and money will all of this require? Will they be spent in vain in our country?

Optimists argue: "We need to adopt the Law on the Freedom of Exit from the country as soon as possible, and the issue of hijackings will no longer exist!" What will it change? We will beat our own iron curtain into plowshares, but it will snap shut again, this time on the other side of the border. Who needs more beggars, criminals, and psychopaths?

Of course, it is necessary to increase responsibility for the safety of our flights. During the nine months of this year, more than 200 "barrels" of firearms, 398 kilograms of explosives, and 287 grenades and shells were discovered during airport inspections. Hunters, those fond of stunning the fish, and "demobilized" soldiers transport a good deal more of the "stuff."

However, even the most diligent inspection will not stop a hijacker who has rigorously prepared for this. This is why it is perhaps worthwhile to somehow implement the main economic law of socialism—improving the welfare of the working people—more rapidly, using proven capitalist methods. Meanwhile...

As the POSTFAKTUM Agency has reported, on the morning of 29 November an armed detachment seized the airport of the Azeri settlement of Getashen. Flights were temporarily suspended. However, flights in a well-known direction may resume and become more frequent...

From a USSR MVD Order

The investigation of an emergency associated with an attempt to commandeer on 8 March 1988 a plane flying from Irkutsk to Leningrad with a view to flying abroad determined that employees of the inspection service gravely violated the requirements of the instruction for performing inspections... two sawn-off shotguns with ammunition and an explosive device were carried by the criminals onto the plane...

I Order:

1. To severely reprimand Militia Colonel L.V. Sokolov, chief of the East Siberian Internal Affairs Administration for Transportation,...for serious shortcomings in the organization of work of the inspection service.
2. To warn Militia Colonel A.P. Yelfimov, deputy chief of the East Siberian Internal Affairs Administration for Transportation, about the substandard performance of duty... for the unsatisfactory management of the internal affairs line organs in air transportation.
3. To relieve Militia Major V.I. Belevich, chief of the Line Department of Internal Affairs in the city of Irkutsk airport, of his post and reassign him with a demotion... for failing to secure the area of work entrusted to him.
4. To discharge Militia Captain K.Sh. Dzhikiya, shift supervisor of the inspection service of the Line Department of Internal Affairs in the city of Irkutsk airport, from the internal affairs organs for failing to ensure the monitoring of work of the inspection team and relaxing his vigilance...

[Signed] Minister Colonel General A. Vlasov

P.S. This is how the functionaries of the inspection service "suffered". They were to blame for the Ovechkin brothers managing to carry weapons on board the plane inside a double-bass case, resulting in the death of a stewardess and three passengers.

Oversight Committee Outlaws Secret Enactments*PM1112165990 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
1 Dec 90 Union Edition p 1*

[A. Davydov report under the rubric "In the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee": "Secret Acts Abolished"]

[Text] During a scheduled session on 29 November, the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee discussed the question of whether our present practice of allowing the application of unpublished normative acts on citizens' rights, freedoms, and responsibilities conforms with the USSR Constitution and international law.

The session published the following information: USSR KGB experts estimate that 70 percent of all legal acts concerning Soviet citizens' rights and freedoms are classified to some extent. The USSR Supreme Soviet Presidium, USSR Council of Ministers, USSR KGB, USSR Internal Affairs Ministry, and USSR Council of Ministers State Customs Control Main Administration alone have a total of 210 acts currently in force that are marked "secret," "for official use only," "not for the press," and "special file." It is quite often the case (there are hundreds of examples!) that direct instructions to issue a classified act are contained in USSR Council of Ministers resolutions addressed to the KGB.

The conclusion adopted by the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee on the results of the discussion notes that the conditions exist for the arbitrary, illegal restriction of rights and freedoms in a manner beyond society's control, for the imposition of additional, often extremely burdensome responsibilities on citizens, and also for the granting of unwarranted privileges. People are deprived of the possibility to exercise their constitutional and other rights and freedoms in the full sense of the word. The struggle against arbitrariness is made more difficult and obstacles are placed in the way of appealing against illegal actions by state bodies and officials.

In a number of cases, the committee's conclusion says, citizens are liable to face legal charges for breaking rules they have not been able to learn. Moreover, prosecution for divulging a state secret or losing documents containing a state secret often depends on the stamp of confidentiality on these documents, which is placed there at the discretion of ministry, department, enterprise, and organization leaders.

Guided by the USSR Constitution—requiring Soviet citizens to abide by Soviet laws—and by international legal norms, the USSR Constitutional Oversight Committee adopted the following decision.

Point 1: Publishing laws and other normative acts concerning citizens' rights, freedoms, and responsibilities, or, in other words, conveying them by whatever means to the general public, is a mandatory condition of these acts being applied. Articles of laws and other normative

provisions lose their force from the time of this decision's adoption with regard to any section which directly or indirectly allows the enforcement of unpublished normative acts concerning citizens' rights, freedoms, and responsibilities.

Point 2: On the basis of Article 22 of the USSR Law on Constitutional Oversight in the USSR, previously adopted, but unpublished normative acts concerning citizens' rights, freedoms, and responsibilities are liable to publication by the appropriate state bodies within three months of this decision's adoption. Any acts which remain unpublished will lose their force on the expiration of this period.

Experts who addressed the session agreed that studying the question of classified normative acts is only part of a major problem: The legal basis of the regime of secrecy that exists in the Soviet Union. The committee intends to continue this work.

Press Briefing on Chernobyl Clean-up*LD2412182690 Moscow TASS in English
1804 GMT 24 Dec 90*

[By TASS correspondents Aleksandr Kanishchev and Igor Peskov]

[Text] Moscow 24 December TASS—Gratitude to the sponsors and supporting countries of the resolution on Chernobyl, adopted on December 21 by the 45th U.N. General Assembly session, was expressed by Viktor Gubanov, deputy chairman of the Soviet State Commission for Emergency Situations. Gubanov heads the committee for clean-up operations at Chernobyl.

The resolution, Gubanov told a news conference here today, envisions a wide range of measures and international cooperation on long-term effects of the Chernobyl disaster.

It prepares for further cooperation under the U.N. system, and aims at greater efficiency, coordination and interaction of all Chernobyl projects.

Under the U.N. resolution, a special working group is being set up to focus efforts by various organizations on the basic directions of the Chernobyl issue, to avoid duplication and dispersal of means.

Gubanov stressed that the resolution did not imply additional foreign aid to the Soviet Union. Aid is already coming in from IAEA [International Atomic Energy Authority], WHO, UNEP [United Nations Environment Program], UNESCO, FAO [UN Food and Agriculture Organization], and other organizations, he said. Virtually all U.N. specialized agencies have plans for bilateral cooperation with the Soviet Union in this field, but these plans need further specification and coordination.

Gubanov stressed that the Soviet Union is doing all it can to implement U.N. recommendations. He recalled that the Soviet parliament approved an original plan to

help people living in the disaster area. He said that 116,000 people have already been resettled from the area and an additional 219,000 will have been resettled by 1992. A concept is now being developed for practical assistance to the people living in the region for the periods ending in 1995 and 2000.

The governments of the Soviet Union and individual Soviet republics, Gubanov told the news conference, have planned to allot 10.2 billion rubles to finance clean-up efforts until the end of 1991. He said the sum was one billion roubles greater than the losses sustained by the country during the first three years after the 1986 disaster.

On the future of the Chernobyl power plant, Gubanov said that the concrete sarcophagus of the exploded unit dependably sealed the radiation source and would reliably protect the environment for the next ten years.

Work is underway to design reliable technical protection in the long term. Gubanov stressed that plans have been made to start shutting down the power plant's remaining three units—one each year—beginning in 1993 to completion in 1995.

Consequences of Chernobyl Accident Reviewed

LD1312115490

[Editorial Report] Moscow World Service in Russian at 1030 GMT 13 December, in a three-minute report attributed to INTERFAX, says that an international radiation medical center has been set up in Obninsk under the auspices of the WHO.

The purpose of the center is to study and eliminate the consequences of the Chernobyl disaster. Scientists from Obninsk, together with USSR and Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic [RSFSR] health experts, having investigated all the groups of those affected by the accident, have compiled a large-scale program to compile a medical register. Data on over 500,000 people has been collected. Those who took part in eliminating the consequences of the disaster—87,000 people—are under special medical control. Scientific data shows that the incidence of illness has gone up in this group of people. Immediately after the accident it was thought that 22,000 people were ill. Now it is known that the figure is higher. Sixteen percent of those affected are children, five percent are juveniles. Scientists have compiled charts which shows the spread of radioactivity and illness. The Ukraine has 46 percent of those that have been affected by the accident, Belorussia has 28 percent, and the RSFSR has 18 percent.

Scientists from the Obninsk Institute took part in investigations in Semipalatinsk and Chelyabinsk. As a result of the activities of the Mayak Production Association in Chelyabinsk, there have been three radiation accidents. Radioactive waste of approximately 1 billion Curie is to be found on the territory of this enterprise and in the

vicinity of the enterprise, in the rivers, lakes, and marshes. It is the first time that this figure has been given.

Chernobyl Victims in Tula Receive CPSU Funds

PM0801163191 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
5 Jan 91 Second Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Out of the CPSU Budget"]

[Text] Tula, 4 Jan—The Tula CPSU Oblast Committee [obkom] has received the impressive sum of 12 million rubles. The money has been allocated from Central Committee funds to assist the people of Tula Oblast who have suffered as a result of the Chernobyl accident.

The party obkom bureau decided to send the bulk of the sum to the 16 rayons contaminated by radioactive fallout. The rest of the money will be used for oblast measures, in particular the organization of children's health camps, the creation of a computer system to monitor children's health, the acquisition of medical and diagnostic equipment, and the repair and reconstruction of health institutions.

Assistance has been given to the people of Tula Oblast in accordance with the 28th CPSU Congress decision to aid areas of Belorussia, the Ukrainian Soviet Socialist Republic, and the Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic affected by the Chernobyl accident.

Turnout Low at Omsk Anti-Gorbachev Rally

91UN0451A Moscow RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA
in Russian 7 Dec 90 p 4

[Article by M. Kutorgin: "Silently, as Though at a Funeral..."]

[Text] Omsk—The Omsk activists of "Democratic Union" have long been famous for the fact that they cannot collect more than 100 or so curious onlookers at rallies in a city of a million residents. Their belligerence and claims to express the "aspirations of the people" have begun to pall.

Nor have their latest measures added to the popularity of the members of "Democratic Union." V. Novodvorskaya, an "agitator" from the center, arrived to support the lone prophets and rouse all the city dwellers to a political strike and civil disobedience. I do not know how she was received in other cities, but the residents of Omsk demonstrated obvious reserve not only in their reaction to the appeals of the traveling "lecturer" but also in terms of simple human curiosity. Only about 60 people gathered in the center of the city where the rally was planned.

There was a detail that was unusual for such demonstrations. The rally took place in a chilly silence, without the traditional cries of support. I will risk suggesting that the cause was not in the unity of the convictions of those who had assembled. More likely it was the public's

distinctive reaction to the revelations of Novodvorskaya, who repeatedly called for the "overthrow of Gorbachev."

It seems that even the local aktiv of "Democratic Union" were quite shocked by the filth that their leader poured out on both the president of the country and the head of the Russian parliament.

In short, the rally, that had not been sanctioned by the local authorities, took place unnoticed. With only one qualification. The militia, who attended in small numbers, showed indifference, as they say. Apparently the city soviet is still trying to figure out whether it should consider the cry "Down with Soviet power!" and other such things to be nonviolent measures in a struggle with the existing system or not. However, to my question about his view of the slogan "Down with the soviets!" V. Korb, one of the representatives of the cities authorities who observed what happened at the rally, responded without a second thought:

"I share that idea."

The "deputy" perplexed me considerably with his statement. After all, he is the one who seeks out the microphone more often than the rest at long sessions of the city soviet and is constantly clarifying or adding something. But it turns out that this is simply a screen....

Something else. I can testify that, at an appeal by the organizers of the rally to walk past the building of the obkom [oblast party committee], no more than 30 people responded....

The small group of people, observing traffic rules and surprising those they met by their deathly silence, walked up to the CPSU obkom, photographed one another against it—for history—and departed unnoticed.

Moscow Rally Marks Human Rights Day

LD1012010590 Moscow TASS in English 1630 GMT
9 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow December 9 TASS—A rally was held in Moscow today to mark the international Human rights day. It was attended by people's deputies of the USSR, the Russian Federation, the Moscow and district councils and leaders of social and political organisations.

Representatives of human rights and religious organisations, soldiers' mothers, representatives of strike committees from other cities and compatriots from abroad were also invited to take part in the rally.

Speakers revered the memory of Andrey Sakharov, who died on December 14, 1989. A delegation was sent to the Vostryakovskiy cemetery to lay wreaths on Sakharov's grave.

After adopting a resolution, participants in the meeting headed for the Lubyanskaya Square with lit candles. A civil ceremony was held there near a stone brought from

the Solovetskiye Islands in honour of victims of Stalin's repressions. An office for the dead was performed. To the singing of a church choir, participants laid wreaths and flowers to the stone.

Deputy head of the Moscow Police Department Nikolay Myrikov told TASS that over 2,000 policemen were protecting order in Moscow today. "It is a large figure for Moscow with its complicated criminogenic situation," he said.

"Rally organisers claimed that some 100,000 people will take part in the rally. But there were only 3,000 participants and their number fell to some 2,000 an hour later. Usually, representatives of all our departments are taking part in preparations for such actions," he said.

"It was especially difficult to work for the traffic inspection, as they had to stop traffic in Tverskaya Street where the rally began. Such rallies inflict serious losses to the city budget. We receive lots of complaints from our foreign guests, as the street leads to Moscow's international airport. I am sure that the city authorities should think over a place for such actions, especially in winter," Myrikov said.

'Soapbox Democracy' of Manezh Rally Hit

PM1212170190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 11 Dec 90 Single Edition p 4

[A. Ryabov report: "With Rights at the Ready. The Grimaces of Soapbox Democracy"]

[Text] A rally-demonstration was held in Moscow last Sunday, on the eve of World Human Rights Day and the anniversary of A.D. Sakharov's death.

However, those motivated by genuine concern for their children's future, who marched in neat lines to Manezh Square, and who possibly really had gathered to mourn the innocent dead, simply found themselves drawn into a hysterical discussion about the absolute power of the "party-administrative dictatorship" and the need to dismantle the USSR as soon as possible, coupled with demands for the immediate resignation of the Union government, the USSR defense minister, and the country's president.

While one speaker after another pilloried the CPSU and its general secretary, representatives of newly formed parties and organizations hastily recruited new followers from among the people standing in the square. Others, selling diverse party literature brought to the square by the rucksackful, scurried among the rally participants. There were also some strapping young men touting collections of badges with everything from the two-headed eagle and the Russian tricolor to the words "I am a KGB agent." A distributor for the press organ of the Confederation of Anarcho-Syndicalists, a pretty young woman, came up to me:

"Take a copy, it only costs a ruble," she said in a plaintive voice. "And the main thing is that it contains a full 24 pages!"

We got talking. It turned out that the young woman is a student at one of Moscow's higher education establishments. Many students now make good money from distributing this kind of literature.

"The only problem is that the market is oversaturated with our publications, and there are not many people here today..."

Indeed, the distributors' bags were in no hurry to shed their load, despite the fact that there seemed to be a very broad choice on offer: All kinds of journals, fashionable samizdat newspapers, and even brightly colored collections of RSFSR passports. But politics and primitive market economics were so tightly interwoven on the square that they possibly only impeded each other. Even the racy publication "Mainly for Women" included a reprint of another chapter from the [Boris Yeltsin] bestseller "Against the Grain." Whether in the minds of the authors of the publication no one can handle intimate relations these days without at least some political training, or whether something else lies behind this, is hard to understand.

But, as it turned out, this is not the only mystery of the "politics-market" union. On an improvised table set up by the Russian Democratic Party I even found special forms to be filled in by "Russian Democratic Party sympathisers." Wishing to express my genuine sympathy for the Democrats, I was unexpectedly stopped in my tracks, however, by the price list next to the pile of papers: It would cost me three rubles [R]. I found myself irrelevantly thinking: Better to have 100 friends than R100. Evidently, friends without money are not highly thought of at present...

Either cold or disillusionment gradually took people away from the rally, but the bellicose, vindictive appeals and declarations continued to float after them from the public address.

A group of elderly intellectual Moscow women passed around a thermos flask of hot tea. They seemed to be habitués of spectacles like this: They obviously knew that even the fieriest of speeches cannot warm you or satisfy your hunger.

Seriously though, I would not blame the weather alone for the fact that far fewer than the hundreds of thousands of Muscovites promised by the organizers of the rally-demonstration were actually present in the square. In a way, that would be like explaining away Napoleon's defeat in 1812 or Hitler's defeat outside Moscow by the mysterious Russian frost. But there are other factors involved. It is now obvious that people have grown tired of noisy rallies and the hysterical wave of denunciations and abuse. More and more are coming to realise that "soapbox democracy" is pointless and unproductive and that alluring slogans about rights, sovereignty, and

rebirth merely serve as a screen for certain forces in their acquisition of political influence.

One of the people invited—an Orthodox priest—reminded his audience of Christ's words: If you would improve the world, first improve yourself. This is very useful advice, in my opinion, and it subsequently proved to be topical as well as useful. In the course of the rally, a Great Patriotic War veteran was allowed to speak. I did not catch his name, unfortunately: Unlike the previous speakers—such as USSR People's Deputies N. Ivanov and S. Belozertsev, RSFSR People's Deputies V. Ryumin and Ye. Ambartsumov, and others—he was not so popular. But as long as the former frontline fighter talked about his current ordeals he was given quite devout attention. However, when, at the end of his speech, he urged Communists to be real Leninist Communists and do their utmost to promote strict observance of human rights in the country, his audience, immediately sensing danger, started booing and noisily voicing their protest. The person chairing the rally was forced to inform everyone in an apologetic tone that the blunder had occurred because the speeches had not been discussed beforehand...

Penalties Facing Unregistered Papers Detailed

PM0401134391 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 4 Jan 91 First Edition p 2

[TASS report: "Risk of Fine"]

[Text] Difficult days are beginning for existing mass media that have not been registered with the USSR State Committee for the Press. Their founders run the risk of a fine of up to 500 rubles (R) and confiscation of the entire print run.

If an unregistered publication is published again there is criminal liability and a fine of up to R1,000 along with confiscation of the equipment used to produce the print run.

Henceforth publications created before the entry into force of the Law on the Press which missed the deadline set for registration by the USSR Supreme Soviet without good reason are to be registered only after an appropriate judicial decision is adopted.

As A. Gorkovlyuk, deputy chairman of the USSR State Committee for the Press told your TASS correspondent, in all his department received 1,550 applications, almost 800 of them new ones. Precisely 1,304 publications have been registered, including 603 new ones. Certificates have been presented to the leaders of 776 newspapers and magazines.

Journalists' Saturday 'Antistrike' Reported

PM0801135791

[Editorial Report] Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 8 January 1991 carries on page one under the headline "This Issue Will Not Pass! On

Saturday 5 January at 1200 Hours KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA Journalists Went to Work Together. Warning Antistrike Had Begun" a 700-word feature by A. Pankratov and V. Tkachuk. The feature begins:

"Who is knocking on my door with a thick bag on a strap...' Do you still remember the children's rhyme? Alas, it is a long time since mailmen knocked on our apartment doors and it looks as though fresh newspaper has become one item in lamentably short supply in the era of perestroika and glasnost.

"The 'quiet strike' of printing, paper, and mail departments headed by a strike committee which has remained incognito has already in this new year deprived millions of Soviet citizens of THEIR LEGAL issue of the newspaper TRUSTINGLY PAID FOR IN ADVANCE.

"That is why the reports on the 'Komsomolka' journalists' Saturday antistrike has grown old even before it was born. Our action has already been reported by the radio, television (repeatedly), samizdat publications, and foreign newspapers and 'voices...' Tell us, do you need news from the day before the day before yesterday?

"Nevertheless... What happened on Saturday? Nothing special. The editorial office teletype and telefax machines were rattling away as usual, stenographers were screeching down the telephone, journalists' pens were squeaking on the paper, the typewriters were clattering. We were working as usual for you, the readers. You did not even know for instance...

"...what happened to the rebellious elephant at Kiev zoo;

"...how Turkey recognized the sovereignty of the republic of Tatarstan;

"...why the Ukraine was almost deprived of the publication of all republican newspapers;

"...what the latest prices were on the country's black markets;

"...about the latest rail accident;

"...about the first people to respond and admit that they are 'zombies';

"...and also about much else that is useful, notable, or simply interesting.

"Our antistrike was peaceful and took place in an organized and even useful way—we prepared some items for the next few issues. Nonetheless we hope that our voice will be heeded.

"Otherwise layoffs threaten one sixth of journalists of all newspapers. Otherwise the Soviet man will lag behind the whole planet in the information field. Otherwise we will be unable to build any rule-of-law state if essentially tens of millions of citizens have been robbed in broad daylight."

There follows a "report from Voronezh" on a demonstration in support of the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA journalists, a brief mention of the fact that "a further 24 of our own correspondents supported the KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA antistrike" and that a report by A. Kupriyanov, the paper's London correspondent, describing his demonstration in Hyde Park in support of his colleagues is published on page three of the same issue. The feature then publishes four telegrams of support from readers and concludes:

"P.S. Today the USSR people's deputies will meet for a session of the country's Supreme Soviet. Their voters are the newspapers' subscribers and readers."

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA States Principles

91UN0636A Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA in Russian 1 Jan 91 p 1

[Statement by the editorial board of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA: "Hello! We Greet Our Readers Hoping to Remain a Daily Newspaper"]

[Text] It is difficult to hazard a prediction while outlining the program of our newspaper for 1991. Can anything be predicted given the current environment of an emergency, instability, and tension? Will our life become better? Or merrier?

Nonetheless, we affirm the continuity of our principles, the first one being to strive for DEMOCRATISM and INDEPENDENCE.

We will not succeed in patching our social system together like a quilt with various Western pieces—democracy, parliamentary rule, a multiparty system, a market, and so on. In the sixth year of perestroika, it was suddenly revealed that there is no democracy without a politically organized society; that it is impossible to get going when nobody is there to produce, but everyone wants to redistribute and consume; that the administrative system has reproduced people in its own image for many years practicing strict selective breeding, and that it is naive to believe that no radical social reform is going to run into stubborn resistance now.

Together with the country, our newspaper is now facing a moment of supreme civic commitment. However, if democratic forces, in whom the people are rapidly losing confidence, fail to come up with and propose a real way out of the situation, if at least elementary order fails to appear, others will quickly take their place. In this case, it will not be difficult to say what the state system is going to be like, being mindful of a recent warning by a resigning minister.

However, while referring to our previous adherence to democratic processes, we do not want to serve up glasnost specials (to say nothing of pouring on a spicy "sauce" too thick), claim credit for storming nonexistent

bastions, and toy with new mythical notions, such as "destructive forces" or "a slowdown mechanism."

We believe that the power of the people is not that of a depersonalized, confused crowd directing its indignation left and right, already controlled by someone (of course, on behalf of and at the request of!). Having gotten rid of one political censorship and one kind of ideological pressure, the journalists of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA have absolutely no desire to be subjected to others.

This is all the more so because the labor collective of KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA has become a cofounder of the newspaper; it has a charter of the editorial office, and firmly intends to proceed from the law on the press.

We welcome only one type of dependence and lack of freedom—this means dependence on our readers, their interests and wishes. This is why KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA will be a newspaper of NATIONAL ACCORD.

The ultrapolitization of our everyday life dictates the third principle: We are in favor of complete and unconditional SOVEREIGNTY OF PERSONALITY and respect for legitimate human rights.

At present, when humanitarian assistance is being rushed to us from all over the world, we want tired people to understand that real *charity* is a prospect for society, an opportunity for every person to apply and use all of his energies and skills. Let us welcome success in our favorite endeavors, well-being in the family, and one's victory over himself, even if minor!

You will ask us whether it is possible to write about love, tenderness, and happiness at present, during a crisis. Indeed, it is necessary! This is because morality cannot be segregated into categories of a higher (political?) and lower (personal-existential?) order. After all, strange as it might be, by failing to hold the door after you passed through this morning in the subway you have already crossed the line of estrangement from one person to another. You may be sure that subsequently the merciless totalitarian mechanism of the state, yet dismantled (primarily within ourselves), will make you knuckle under—one at a time.

KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA continues to be AN ALL-UNION DAILY NEWSPAPER. This means that the VLKSM [All-Union Leninist Communist Youth League] and other youth movements will remain within our field of vision, but the life of individual young people, their social adaptation, view of the world, anxieties and concerns will be even more so.

Frankly, the fifth principle of our newspaper—FREEDOM TO DISSEMINATE INFORMATION and HEALTHY COMPETITION in the information market—is in jeopardy. We are being denied the right to be

a DAILY NEWSPAPER (see the previous issue). Meanwhile, it is now possible to inform readers promptly and completely only in this manner. It is a pity that in the sixth year of perestroyka, the still hesitant glasnost that has not grown to be the freedom of speech is, putting it bluntly, being asked "to walk the street." We repeat that it is a pity. However, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA does not intend to yield!

Yet, giving up hatred is not tantamount to indifference. To paraphrase a well-known motto, we intend to wake up and call the living, ignoring neither students nor presidents!

All of us are tired of slogans and "cursed" questions. In summation, let us recall only the wise words of an ancient Oriental tale—the most difficult part is not to slay the Dragon, but rather not to become one yourself.

We thank you all for your confidence. Let us go on living!

[Signed] The Editorial Board

PRAVDA Reports on Subscriptions, Sunday Issues

Distribution Discrimination Claimed

PM1212163990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
8 Dec 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by G. Isayeva under "Opening the Envelope" rubric: "Kiosk 'Censorship'"]

[Text] Novosibirsk—I cannot help but react to V. Gerasimov's comment headlined "Unwelcome Newspapers" published in PRAVDA 22 October. I wanted to write to you back in August-September, when I was living in Leningrad for three weeks, about the fact that a deliberate campaign is being mounted there against the party press. In the time I was there I only managed to buy PRAVDA three or four times because many vendors at Soyuzpechat kiosks always replied malevolently that they did not get and do not want to get this newspaper. Automatic newspaper vending machines in the corridor at Nevskiy Prospekt subway station bear the inscription PRAVDA, but there are no newspapers. At the same time virtually every issue of SMENA, which was fighting for "independence" at that time, reported gloatingly: So many thousands of copies of PRAVDA have been pulped over the last week as surplus to requirements.

It is a lie that they are surplus to requirements—many people went up to Soyuzpechat kiosks while I was there, asking for PRAVDA, but they were always turned away.

Over the last few weeks I have seen press statements by Soyuzpechat leaders that they cannot guarantee that "unpopular" publications will be given space at their kiosks. Yet we can see that some publications are being made "unpopular" artificially. In my opinion, there

should be a more effective mechanism for circulating the party press, sidestepping the Soyuzpechat monopoly.

I think that Communists themselves should take care to ensure that the truth reaches people via PRAVDA.

Views Sunday Issues, Supplements

PM0901133791 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
9 Jan 91 Second Edition p 1

[PRAVDA apology to readers: "PRAVDA Not Sent to Readers"]

[Text] Because of numerous appeals from citizens, the PRAVDA editorial office and the "Pravda" Publishing House once again apologizes to subscribers and also to those people who buy our newspaper from "Soyuzpechat" [Main Administration for the Distribution of Printed Matter] kiosks for the fact that PRAVDA is henceforth to be published only six times a week. It was not our decision, but we did announce it in a timely fashion in the course of the subscription campaign. We have frequently sounded the alarm in our newspaper over the paper shortage and statements from the Ministry of Communications. First they refused to organize Sunday deliveries of that day's newspapers to readers and then gave assurances that deliveries would take place.

From the beginning of 1991 we have been forced to come back to this important question over and over. We published a sharp signal from our correspondent 3 January, naming specific senior officials standing between our new paper and the reader. It was then clear that on Sunday and holidays the Ministry of Communications, despite its promises and assurances, would disrupt delivery of the day's newspapers. We told our readers the Ministry of Communications' final decision 5 January: Henceforth mailmen are to take Sundays off.

Well, it sincerely grieves us to part with our Sunday editions, and we tried to make them as good as possible—and fill with most interesting, complete information on domestic and international subjects—preparing witty pieces and giving readers a chance to ponder trenchant, topical problems of the day. However, so as not to remain in your debt, the editorial office has begun to publish an enlarged Saturday edition, we will try to compensate for the loss of the Sunday edition.

What is more, we remind you that we will still be trying to realize our goal of producing a Sunday supplement to the newspaper.

Issues Appeal for Readers

PM2012122190 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
19 Dec 90 Second Edition p 1

[Message from PRAVDA editorial collegium and CPSU Central Committee PRAVDA publishing house to

CPSU organizations and PRAVDA supporters clubs: "PRAVDA Is Your Paper, Party Members!" date not given]

[Text] To party committees of CPSU republican, kray, oblast, city, and rayon organizations and PRAVDA supporters clubs.

As is known, there has been a marked drop in the number of subscribers to PRAVDA, and, indeed, to many other newspapers and journals, for 1991. The sharp increase in the cost of newsprint, printing, and delivery of newspapers was a decisive factor. By no means everyone is able to set aside from the family budget a sum for an annual subscription. So the demand for street sales is bound to increase. According to information from our own correspondents and a number of communications enterprises, it will be an increase of 50-100 percent. In some regions retail orders have already been amended in an upward direction. People everywhere must be ready to do this. But there are worrying cases where "Soyuzpechat" enterprises have refused to take the CPSU press or requests for it have been cut for no valid reason when orders for next year have been drawn up.

The PRAVDA editorial collegium and publishing house appeal to the party committees of republics, krays, and oblasts, party committees of enterprises and organizations, kolkhozes and sovkhoses, and to PRAVDA supporters clubs, saying: Let us step up joint efforts and ensure that the party's central organ reaches every communist and all our supporters. One may find local opportunities for providing incentives for "Soyuzpechat" kiosk-holders, for creating alternative structures for the distribution of the newspaper on an economic accountability basis—particularly in resort areas, on transport, in large stores, hotels, and service enterprises. In labor collectives numbering thousands of people one might introduce the institution of freelance kiosk-holders and distributors, enlist members of PRAVDA supporters clubs, and decide on forms of moral and material incentives for them derived from party organizations' funds and from other sources. For its part, the PRAVDA editorial board will join the publishing house in finding funds to encourage this work.

PRAVDA is first and foremost your paper, party members! We must stand together and communicate the ideas of perestroika to the masses.

[Signed] PRAVDA editorial collegium and CPSU Central Committee PRAVDA publishing house.

SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on Publishing Problems

Views Sunday Nonpublication

PM0801130991 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 8 Jan 91 First Edition p 1

[Editorial: "An Attack on Glasnost—the Readers' Verdict"]

[Text] On Sunday 6 January 1991, the very eve of the Christmas holiday, subscribers to most central newspapers received an early Christmas present—none of their

newspapers, SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA included, appeared in their mailboxes. Neither did the newstands open on that day (in Moscow, at any rate).

From first light on Monday morning there was a barrage of indignant telephone calls. But what could we tell our readers? In truth, there was nothing we could say because we ourselves simply do not know where, how, or by whom (and why without consulting the readers) this unprecedented decision was made: That henceforth almost all the central daily newspapers will cease to be dailies. Henceforth, life in the editorial office on Saturdays will grind to a halt: The teletypes will be silent and the telefaxes still....

No newspapers means no information, no movement. Take this timely example: Toward the end of last week a vital decree by the country's president on the immediate tasks for implementing the land reform was adopted, but it was not until today, Tuesday—in other words after a significant delay—that people at local level were informed of this in detail through their newspapers....

We share the readers' indignation and join them in asking: Why, indeed, is it that newspapers and periodicals have been cast into the icy waters of the market? A reader subscribes for 300 issues of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA—how many will he receive now that the newspaper appears only five times and the subscription price has doubled? Who, by which method and on which computer, set the new issue price at 10 kopecks instead of the previous four or five?

There are many questions but no answers. For example, we are assured that there is not enough paper for newspapers to be printed daily. But how can there be a shortage when circulation has fallen sharply? Government officials confirm: When allocating the funds for paper, the USSR Council of Ministers allowed for six issues at previous [circulation] levels. But maybe they are telling the truth when they say that it is useless to refer to government resolutions nowadays.

It seems that the current marketing dispute over newspaper production is making a mockery of glasnost.

Sees Distributor's 'Discrimination'

PM1412144190 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 8 Dec 90 Second Edition p 6

[Report by V. Mazurov, A. Chernyakov, V. Sharov, and V. Andryushin under "Bare Fact" rubric: "And They Have Struck Us Off"]

[Text] Several telephone calls with the callers asking one and the same question—why has it become difficult to buy SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in Moscow?—encompassed me to go and have a look in the "Soyuzpechat" kiosks.

"No, we have had no deliveries of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA in the past few days," the proprietor of the kiosk outside No. 103 on Peace Avenue said. "I can offer you ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA. I've been given 200 copies of it today, and I'm afraid I might not sell it by this evening."

Our search was also in vain at the kiosk on Krasnoprudnaya, a stone's throw from Yaroslav Station.

"Have you been unable to obtain SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA for a long time then?"

"They stopped delivering it at the end of November. At the same time they increased the number of copies of ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA, although 150-200 of the 500 copies remain unsold."

"We have all been 'undermined' by ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA," L. Karamova, chief of the Dzerzhinskiy Interrayon "Soyuzpechat" Agency, stated. "Previously we received 22,000 copies of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA on average. At the end of November our delivery of ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA increased sharply—up to 29,000. We were told: Regulate sales yourselves, but whatever you do don't reduce the sale of ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA. So we decided not to sell SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA for a few days in order to show that even without competition we will not shift such a large volume of ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA. Now your newspaper will again be available in the kiosks."

Note that the Dzerzhinskiy Interrayon "Soyuzpechat" Agency serves 338 kiosks and 14 specialized stores on the territory of five rayons: Dzerzhinskiy, Babushkinskiy, Kuybyshevskiy, Kirovskiy, and Sokolnicheskii.

But is it possible that this kind of discrimination is occurring only here?

To answer this question we went along to the Bauman-skiy Interrayon Agency, which serves the capital's central rayons. However, beforehand we looked in at the kiosk on Sretenka, directly beneath the windows of the agency. At 1230 hours there was only ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA. The 50 copies of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA, as the salesman said, sold out immediately.

"So why are so few copies of our newspaper available?" we asked, puzzled.

"Probably there's not much demand for it," Ye. Babayeva, chief of the Bauman-skiy Interrayon Agency, answered. Our objections did not convince Yelena Georgiyevna, and she added: "We have enough problems with subscriptions at the moment, we sit up all night over them."

Well I never! Meanwhile readers are calling in indignation that many communications offices are not accepting subscriptions from people who would like to receive the newspaper as of February...

Our next interlocutor was V. Bulychev, deputy chief of the Moscow City "Soyuzpechat" Production Association.

"There has been no reduction in retail sales," he said. "We are now selling 119,300 daily. On actual orders from our agencies. Returns are within the norm—approximately 0.5 percent.

"Valeriy Yurevich, what effect has the appearance of new publications on the counters had on the newspaper market?"

"Our association distributes 3 million copies of various newspapers daily. And no more. Whether we want to or not. Therefore newspapers really need the retail sales that are actually made. They wanted us to sell almost half a million copies of both ROSSIYA and ROSSIYSKAYA GAZETA daily. We moved to meet this request, and we checked the actual sales. There was a huge return. Now we are going to take 100,000."

"So, as we understand it, in order to fit into this procrustean bed, when new publications appear, the sales of the old ones have to be reduced?"

"Why reduced? In essence we must divide these three million as of 1 January thus: 1 million—union newspapers, 1 million—Moscow newspapers, and 1 million—Russian newspapers. But how we are going to determine it in reality, only time will tell."

Will it? "Soyuzpechat" is a state organization, and certain state organs are quite capable of insisting on dividing up the Russian and the capital's million as they want, without leaving room for Communist Party publications such as SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA and MOSKOVSKAYA PRAVDA, for instance.

And you can easily see that this prospect is more than realistic and is already coming true when you look at the photograph of the invoice drawn up in kiosk No. 660 in Leskov Street, which comes under the Dzerzhinskiy Interrayon Agency. The one whose boss, L. Karamova, assured us four days ago: "Your newspaper will be in the kiosks again now..."

"We are only being given 50 copies of SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA," A. Kostikova, "proprietor" of the kiosk, said. "And that is only a couple of times a week. They are sold out in half an hour."

Of course, we have nothing against other publications, but in a free competition situation it is exclusively the reader who must vote for or against a newspaper exclusively with his or her ruble. But will the reader have the right to choose? Particularly since the party newspapers and periodicals will not be the most advantageous for "Soyuzpechat" in connection with the relatively low price of the publications and the corresponding trade discount for circulation.

Party publications should really establish their own system for circulation as an alternative to the "Soyuzpechat" system. Party committees—including rayon and oblast committees and party committees in enterprises and kolkhozes [collective farms]—must be actively involved in selling CPSU newspapers and periodicals, which will not only make it possible to bring Communists' opinion to the people but will also supplement their budget with money received as a percentage of sales. There are other ways. But they all require masses of time and the solution of countless technical difficulties. And the problem is already big enough and is no laughing matter—will the readers of PRAVDA, RABOCHAYA TRIBUNA, and SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA be able to buy these newspapers in "Soyuzpechat" kiosks? The question is still up in the air...

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Subscription Campaign Results

PM0712112590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 4 Dec 90 First Edition p 1

[Unattributed report: "The Subscription Campaign Has Ended, But It Also Goes On"]

[Text] The 1991 subscription campaign ended officially on 15 November. It took a while to tot up the figures and analyze the statistics but now we can discuss the results with sufficient certainty, summarize, and draw comparisons...

One of the main results is the sharp fall in the circulations of virtually all publications—which was not hard to predict even before the subscription campaign began. After all, newspapers and magazines entered the campaign with considerably increased prices.

Nevertheless, in these difficult conditions, KRASNAYA ZVEZDA has managed to retain more than half its subscribers, to be more precise 56 percent of this year's circulation. That means around 615,000 people.

Readers would probably like to know how this figure compares with that of other publications. Some central newspapers have held on to more subscribers (and this indicator is the most telling): TRUD has 82.8 percent, KOMSOMOLSKAYA PRAVDA 76.8 percent. But IZVESTIYA has retained only 38.4 percent of its subscribers for next year, PRAVDA 30.3 percent, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA 23.8 percent, OGONEK 35.3 percent...

But let us return to subscriptions to our newspaper. The subscription indicators in various republics and regions provide food for thought. Why, for example, has the RSFSR achieved a higher figure—60 percent—than the Ukraine—49 percent? The low indicators in Latvia (48 percent) and Georgia (31 percent) can probably be explained by the complex political situation and the anti-Army campaign. However the figure in Lithuania is 78 percent, and in Estonia 61 percent. It seems that people need KRASNAYA ZVEZDA and remain loyal to

it despite the fact that in some places that is a dangerous thing to do... The subscription figure in Azerbaijan is quite good—68 percent. But in the Central Asian republics, unfortunately, there is a considerable drop in circulation. Uzbekistan, for example, achieved only 43 percent and Kirghizia 39 percent... All this undoubtedly needs serious analysis.

The indicator in the Armed Forces is essentially the same as for the country as a whole—56 percent of this year's total, or 211,000 subscribers. Analyzing the figures by military districts, fleets, and groups of forces, the best indicators are in the Pacific Fleet (73 percent), the Northern Group of Forces (67.9 percent), the Transbaykal Military District (67.2 percent), and the Northern Fleet (65.9 percent). The lowest percentages are in the Carpathian Military District (53.2), the Baltic Military District (52.8), the North Caucasus Military District (52.7), the Far East Military District (50.2), the Defense Ministry Air Defense Forces (50.0), and the Kiev Military District (44.6).

Of course there is no simple interpretation of these figures. The conditions and circumstances behind them vary. In some places they are influenced by insufficient activeness from the command, political organs, and party organizations in publicizing the central military newspaper, elsewhere they underestimated its role. But another factor cannot be ignored: Namely, how seriously the subscription drive was influenced by the reduction of the forces, their withdrawal from Eastern Europe, and the various relocations and redeployments and the inevitable social problems that these entail. Analysis shows that there were very many officers and NCOs who wanted to subscribe to KRASNAYA ZVEZDA but couldn't because of uncertainty over their own future and because of unresolved questions relating to housing and everyday life. In our view, it is still not too late to reexamine such facts, pay attention to people, and do everything to reduce to a minimum the number of servicemen prevented from obtaining the newspaper.

Of course, you can buy KRASNAYA ZVEZDA at Soyuzpechat kiosks, too. As far as we are aware, that is what many people plan to do. Well, that is one way but we should point out straight away that this is less convenient and less advantageous. In the first place, the newspaper's retail price is considerably higher: an annual subscription costs 13.80 rubles [R], but if you buy it at a kiosk every day for a year it will cost R22.96. Furthermore, it is already clear that the number of copies delivered to kiosks may be smaller than at present. So we advise people to carefully reconsider taking out a subscription.

"But how?" some may ask. "After all, you yourselves write that the subscription campaign has ended."

Yes, the subscription campaign has ended but subscription for 1991 goes on. If for some reason you missed the subscription deadline, it can be sorted out. You can begin receiving the newspaper from 1 February if you complete a subscription no later than 12 January.

To Drop Sunday Edition

PM0512163990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 5 Dec 90 First Edition p 1

["To Our Readers"—KRASNAYA ZVEZDA headline]

[Text] You have in front of you the edition of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA published on Wednesday 5 December. As you can see, this edition has six pages. Also be prepared for an unusual edition of our newspaper on Saturday 8 December. KRASNAYA ZVEZDA will be published with eight pages.

But instead you will not find your newspaper in your mailboxes or at "Soyuzpechat" kiosks on Sunday. These are the details for this week, which is a trial week. But as of 1 January 1991 five-day publication will become the rule for KRASNAYA ZVEZDA.

The total number of pages in a week will stay the same—26. But nevertheless it can be assumed that the expected changes will not suit everybody. But there is no other choice. Next year the USSR Ministry of Communications will not be delivering newspapers and magazines to subscribers, and they will not be on sale at kiosks either.

We thank you in advance for your understanding of the situation that has developed and hope that it will not affect your good attitude to the newspaper.

Paper on Publication Changes

PM1112094990

[Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 8 December 1990 carries in its First Edition on page 1 a boxed editorial announcement, headlined "To Our Readers," which states:

"As we have already reported, from 1 January 1991 KRASNAYA ZVEZDA will be publishing five times a week. The editorial board has been forced into this measure by the USSR Ministry of Communications, announcing that no periodicals will be delivered to subscribers Sundays or sold in Soyuzpechat kiosks.

"Our newspaper will in any event retain the overall number of pages in its weekly complement—26. So Wednesdays we will publish six pages and Saturdays—eight. Just how this will look in practice we are giving readers the opportunity to evaluate this very week: You have in your hands today the eight-page Saturday issue."

On page 7 of this same issue a further boxed announcement states that "The next issue of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA will be published 11 December."

Rival Publications Dispute Title GLASNOST

PM2012130090 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Dec 90 Union Edition p 3

[Article by V. Georgiyevskiy: "Whose GLASNOST Is the Real One?"]

[Text] The journal GLASNOST, founded by S. Grigoryants and V. Mamedov, was registered 17 December at the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Ministry of the Press and Mass Information.

The publication is intended mainly for inhabitants of Russia and will appear once a month. GLASNOST considers its aim to be the economic, political, and social analysis of events within the country and in the states of Eastern Europe.

Several months earlier another GLASNOST, founded by the CPSU Central Committee, was registered by the USSR State Committee for the Press. This is a weekly supplement to the journal IZVESTIYA TSK KPSS whose primary task is to efficiently provide answers to letters from Communists and all working people and to comment on party decisions.

In answer to IZVESTIYA's question about the relationship between the two publications, Sergey Grigoryants reminded us that the forerunner to the journal GLASNOST was a news bulletin of the same title he had been publishing since 1987. He intends to take his title dispute with the weekly to the courts.

In the opinion of Leontiy Sharov, deputy editor of the weekly GLASNOST: "When we registered our weekly there were no problems. I've heard of this GLASNOST, but have never read it. Could there possibly be any legal dispute over a title? I don't think there are grounds for this. We are different types of publication."

Well what can you say: This is a downright exceptional situation. As far as we know there are no precedents to this type of dispute in the country's legal history. Let us wait for the courts to decide...

Gosteleradio Pressure on TV Shows Scored

91UN0526A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 51, 19 Dec 90 p 3

[Article by Lidiya Polskaya under the rubric "TV Week": "Buckle Up!"]

[Text] It seems that the word "spirituality," so much favored by the new ideology but also pretty well worn by it, will have to move over and give room to something else in the near future. Another definition, related to the first one but a bit more exact—"public morals"—came into the foreground last week. The face of our minister of culture, Gubenko, appeared on the TV screens many times; as fate would have it, in addition to his high position he was also entrusted with control of all-Union morals. An agonizing search for proper phrasing was

reflected on the face of this actor and director; the televised picture of the coming battles did not become any more clear for the viewers, however.

The TV program for that week was put together before the issue of the USSR president's decree. It is an obvious proof that the enemy chosen this time is either weak or non-existent altogether. Public morals can hardly be hurt either by a concert, organized as the conclusion of the international competition of accordion players, or by the TV film "Mumu," or even by the pageant of professional models. Everything points to the fact that the decree is not an event for television, but a campaign. Hopefully this campaign will fade out by itself, as traditionally happens here, and the minister of culture will be freed to deal with more important affairs.

A real event took place inside our television system, without any public knowledge whatever, and in essence it was very far from any artistic problems. TV viewers could only hypothesize about what was happening in Ostankino [Central TV Studio in Moscow] when on Saturday they saw coverage of the RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] Congress of People's Deputies instead of the scheduled "Press-Club." The congress is also a performance, of course, but we have gotten a little tired of it by now.

We have learned from a knowledgeable source that the entire week was taken up with the all intensifying fight between the leaders of Gosteleradio [State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting] and Authors' Television ("ATV"). "Press-Club" anchor, Kira Proshutinskaya, and head of "ATV" Anatoliy Malkin have sent in their letters of resignation. The "ATV" people think it will be accepted and accepted almost with glee. But they also think that this step can only serve to the advantage of the authorities as it will diminish the numbers and possibilities of the fighters. We should not write off the 60's and the 70's, with their repression of culture, as history. Judging by everything that is happening, the present conflict may end with the defeat of everyone who wants to have independence, coupled with freedom of artistic expression. It is quite possible that we will not watch "ATV" on Mondays on the first program any more. At first they were offered a transfer to the second program—with no definite slot or time guaranteed. "WE [capitalization as published] do not need such a program," is the phrase used by the authorities, the echo of which is now making rounds of the Central Television. But what program do THEY need? "The Musical Kiosk" or "Health?" But talk about a transfer to the second program! So far "ATV" has been totally absent in next year's broadcasting chart! Well, it is easy to understand the bosses' actions: In the old days they fought fiercely, but as it turned out not persistently enough, with the "Vzglyad" [A Glance]. They missed the time when the program became a most powerful mouthpiece for the expression of public opinion in the country. Then it became practically impossible to cancel the program. Soon it will be a year since the last effort (headed by M. Nenashv) to take the "Vzglyad" off the

air. They must have decided to celebrate the anniversary with a new success (headed by L. Kravchenko). Unless the decisive appeal "The new generation of TV viewers selects 'ATV'!" sounds, the program will be "stamped out", if we use new terminology. Gosteleradio leaders prefer to weed out the dissenters.

The only thing that I have doubts about as I advance my television-political hypothesis is the idea of the entire trouble being stirred up by L. Kravchenko's team. What if they are just actors in this game? Could this action be part of a plan to "balance out" the rampant democracy? "Buckle up!" just in case!

You can give a tentative answer if you watch TV. It is a boring occupation, especially for those who have to do it as their duty. If you find one or two programs in one evening, you can think your day has not been wasted. In recent weeks I had a lingering impression that the TV is conducting another course of "treatment by sleep." The first sign of that was seen when a two-hour long ice hockey match preceded a 40-minute long symphony which, in its turn, was followed by coverage of the congress and of a parliament session. Here is one of the TWO [capitalization as published] all-Union programs. Its structure betrays the impotence and confusion of our television, which is lost among ideological pointers and prefers to step aside, to the quiet shoulder of the road just in case.

This past week, however, they found a way out, thanks to the efforts of Italy's privately owned television. Silvio Berlusconi, the powerful owner of three TV channels, together with the Christian Dior firm, gave us the most formidable performance of the week—a watered down version of the famous "Octopus." The most crucial issue for us in the new series might have been the education in money laundering through stock exchange operations (see Part 4). For our domestic television it may be an example in mass production as it can feel silently envious of the program's professional qualities. Evidently, it is not only planeloads of spaghetti and powdered milk that are being sent to save us, but planeloads of TV films also: A hunger for spectacle affects the health of a nation just as bad. But we will have to wait for a long time yet before our own Commissioner Kattani or Commissioner Fedeli can appear; all the means and efforts are being put into an uncompromising fight with their own people. Among those the worst enemy might be Leonid Parfenov, host of "The Other Day," who does not stick to the regulations set by the "Vremya" program.

TV Announcer Accused of Distorting Facts

91UN0513A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 18 Dec 90 Second Edition p 3

[Letter to the editor from M. Rutkevich, corresponding member of the USSR Academy of Sciences: "Let Us Compare Data"]

[Text] The statement of Central Television announcer T. Komarova is quite intolerable and incompatible with the work of the mass media. On the program "Vremya" on 13 December, she assumed the functions of a commentator and, after presenting the discussion on the question of private ownership of the land, concluded with the following statement: "It is known that 95 percent of the citizens are 'for' private ownership of the land." (I quote from memory, but I can vouch for the meaning.) Komarova got this figure from ARGUMENTY I FAKTY, No. 48 for 1990. After a well-known attempt at gross falsification of public opinion (see No. 40 for 1989) when the editors tried to count the "for's" and "against's" from postcards sent to the editorial office, this time the editors of the weekly especially stipulated that the count was made from postcards the readers had sent to the editorial offices.

But allow me to say that such a sociological poll is actually intended to deceive the readers. According to the poll of the USSR State Committee for Statistics, 54 percent of the kolkhoz [collective farm] and sovkhoz [state farm] workers do not want to own the land (PRAVDA, 12 November of this year). According to the data of another poll, 75 percent of the city dwellers are against private ownership of the land, and 83 percent of the sovkhoz and kolkhoz workers are (PRAVDA, 4 December 1990). A commentator on all-Union television could not but know this and, consequently, is deliberately distorting the facts in order to form public opinion in the interests of the political forces that oppose the CPSU.

KGB Man's Problems with 'Vzglyad' Reported

LD2412194690 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 1700 GMT 21 Dec 90

[From the "Vzglyad" section of the "VID," "View and Others" program]

[Text] [begin recording] [Nina Zveryeva] My colleague the journalist Mikhail Vedomy and I are extremely interested in learning whether or not this item is going to appear on the Vzglyad program, because it contains direct criticism of you, dear Vzglyad program presenters.

[Vedomy] So let me introduce you—KGB Captain (Viktor Shamov), who at present still works for the chkalovsk rayon department.

[Zveryeva] KGB Captain (Viktor Shamov) 35 years of age, married with two children. In his free time trains children in unarmed combat. Qualified from the juridical institute. Has served in the airborne landing troops. Has worked in the security organs for 15 years. For eight of these years he was on operational work. KGB Captain (Viktor Shamov) demanded that the security organs be depoliticized. He fought against violations of various kinds in the work of state security. In June 1990 he wrote a letter to the Vzglyad program enclosing a message addressed to Yeltsin.

[(Shamov)] Some time after that—about three or four months—I received a notification through the post saying “Notification from the Vzglyad program” was sent to the KGB directorate for the Gorkiy oblast with a copy to (Shamov), V.A. We are sending you a letter from Comrade (Shamov) sent to the Vzglyad program. Please report the results of its examination to the author of the letter. The editorial department was crossed out. This message bore the signature of O. Subbotina, letters editor, no. 18-0-209 of 25 September 1990.

[Zveryeva] And then it began: rumors spread through the town. Pressure was put on him and on his family. His friends were called up and asked to provide an objective report. In a personal interview Comrade Kiselev, the KGB directorate deputy chief for personnel....

[(Shamov)]...observed ironically that every message, no matter where I sent it, would come to us all the same and pile up in your personal file. Just look—and he showed me, so to speak, the letters that I had sent to Vzglyad, because....

[Zveryeva] (Shamov) had dreamed of working for the security organs from childhood, knowing about the honesty and the decency of the Chekists. The reality compelled him to launch a struggle against injustice. On 27 November he tenders his resignation from the CPSU. On 28 November he appears on Nizhniy Novgorod television.

[(Shamov)] The pressure upon me continued, both moral and psychological and financial. After I had appeared on television very many people telephoned me from the city, they supported my family and when I met them on the street they also expressed approval, so to speak, and said that it was time that order was established in the KGB bodies and that it really was a machine capable of breaking any person and it had to be monitored in an appropriate way.

[Zveryeva] What are you ultimately seeking to achieve? What do you want? When you appeared on Nizhniy Novgorod television, you said that in principle there was no need at all for KGB organs in such a small town as Chkalovsk, if you also took into account the large house that belonged to your organization: Are they needed at all in principle?

[(Shamov)] In principle state security bodies are needed in every state, that is to say we do have external enemies, internal enemies, there are, say, they do not have to be infiltrated into our country, so to speak, to perpetrate acts of sabotage: They can steal our economic secrets in order to use them later somewhere in their own country. But these bodies must be of a purely specific character. They must not take the line of political investigation, in other words if someone thinks something is not right, or if, say, he has decided to voice criticism of, say, the CPSU or if he has left the CPSU or if he has set up some other party of his own, then we have no right and we must not follow that person.

[Zveryeva] (Shamov) was invited to resign. Then they wanted to force him to confess to an offense connected with his duties that he had not committed. In protest (Shamov) went on hunger strike. Now the former CPSU member and, for the present, still KGB Captain (Viktor Shamov) I have no intention of tendering my resignation. I want to see order established if they let me do so. I did not succeed in doing anything. [end recording]

[Announcer] We often used words now and criticize some particular undertaking for doing bad work. As far as the staff of the Nizhniy Novgorod KGB are concerned, this is absolutely not the case, they are splendid workers, and I say this quite seriously and with good grounds, because one week before we received that item from Nina Zveryeva they sent this long telex to our chairman, Comrade Kravchenko. It did indeed report that such and such an item was possibly being sent to us. But we do not conceal any particular item either from our bosses or from you, esteemed staff of the KGB and we have ourselves got hold of a document which was sent to Nizhniy Novgorod television after the interview with (Shamov) was first shown. We know that a meeting of KGB officers took place on 11 December. Issues: the violation of the officer's and Chekist's ethics by (Shamov), V.A., senior operations officer of the Nizhniy Novgorod oblast. As a result of the discussion, the meeting decided first to declare that (“Shamov”'s) action was not in keeping with the ethnics of the officer and Chekist; and to consider (Shamov's) behaviour to be incompatible with his continued service in the state security bodies.

Now—insofar as this letter was addressed to me, though I did not read it, it reached our letters' department—I would also ask for the official reply of our staff members—the staff of the Vzglyad program letters department—to be written [as heard]. More than a quarter of all the letters that are received each week by our program require action on the part of the juridical organizations and careful checking of the facts set out in them. Unfortunately we do not have the ability to carry out this work by our own efforts. In this situation the only thing we can do, using the efforts of the two letters' editors, is to send the inquiry to the authorities by way of consultation and for the facts to be checked and for an answer to be given to the inquirer on the essence of the question; and in many cases we ask for a reply to be sent to the editorial department, too. I have a lot of these replies. It often happens that our editorial department—the editorial department of the Vzglyad program—manages to help.

To complete this item from Nizhniy Novgorod I am able to give today's news, (Shamov) is now in the hospital: he is being brought out of his hunger strike. He is demanding an independent commission from Moscow. He is not agreeing to his dismissal, although he says that pressure is being put upon him. Information for the KGB staff, You see that we simply confine ourselves to the bare information, though it is true that it is not always pleasant information from your point of view.

Radio Rossiya News Chief Interviewed

LD1012083190 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0315 GMT 10 Dec 90

[Studio interview with Vadim Kukushkin, head of the information service of the All-Russian Television and Radio Company "Rossiya", by unidentified announcer—live]

[Text] [Announcer] I would like to introduce you to Vadim Kukushkin, the head of the information service of the new All-Russian Television and Radio Company Rossiya.

[Kukushkin] Good day.

[Announcer] Vadim, what do you intend to do to get people to watch and listen to you?

[Kukushkin] First and foremost, for the first time—a discovery for all—we will have information on the work of the Russian legislature and its committees. That is the first thing. Second, for the first time we will carry the voices of young and other newspaper correspondents whom you have never heard before on All-Union Radio. We are also broadening our correspondents. There will be correspondents not just in the central towns, but correspondents from the Russian backwaters, let's say, who can always cover the problems there. These include agricultural problems, cultural problems, as well as problems to do with raising the standard of living throughout Russia.

[Announcer] Do you consider yourselves an independent company?

[Kukushkin] Well, there are probably no independent companies in our life. For the time being our budget comes from money allocated by the Russian legislature. But I hope that in the not-too-distant future we will be independent.

[Announcer] Does that mean you will carry advertisements? Naturally, as a source of funding.

[Kukushkin] I do not believe advertisements make up a large volume of capital investment in any company. The fact of the matter is that, if we talk of Western companies, the volume amounts to seven or eight percent. The main revenue could come from a joint stock company—it could be public television—or from other sources.

Paper Lists Schedules for 'Radio Rossiya'

PM1712160990 Moscow KOMSOMOLSKAYA
PRAVDA in Russian 9 Dec 90 p 1

[Unattributed report: "New Voice on the Airwaves"]

[Text] "Radio Rossiya" begins regular broadcasting tomorrow as part of the recently created All-Russian State Television and Radio Company.

A word about the people who will "present the voice" of the new radio. They are mainly journalists of the radio station "Yunost," for whom the framework of young people's broadcasting has become confining. But there also quite a few of the young people themselves, who have decided to try their strength in a new field.

So then, let us listen to "Radio Rossiya":

Mornings—from 0630 to 0900 hours (Sundays—from 0700 to 0800)—on the first program of All-Union Radio;

Afternoons—from 1400 to 1600 hours—on the "Radiostantsia 'Mayak'" wavelength;

Evenings—from 2215 hours to midnight—on the Third Program of All-Union Radio.

Volgograd TV To Show Deutsche Welle Programs

PM2112130390 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
20 Dec 90 Union Edition p 7

[Report by correspondent V. Kornev: "From Cologne for Volga Germans"]

[Text] Volgograd—A new program has appeared on Volgograd's television channel—"Deutsche Welle Showing."

"Henceforth," G. Yermolenko, chairman of the Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting, said, "these programs will be broadcast in German every week. Because they are aimed at the Volga Germans, of whom there are now more than 30,000 in Volgograd Oblast."

I was told at the television studio that the first cycle of programs marks the start of an extensive project drawn up here.

Taking the specific nature of the programs into account, it would be difficult to start such a large-scale venture from scratch—that requires cadres and a corresponding base. The television and radio company Deutsche Welle of Cologne has come to the assistance of the Volgograd Oblast inhabitants. It has made available free of charge its news programs and recordings of performances by folklore collectives.

Stations To Produce Pro-Army Programs

LD1312210190

[Editorial Report] Moscow Domestic Service in Russian at 1320 GMT on 13 December carries a three-minute interview of Valeriy Prokofiyevich Voloshin, general director of the television and radio society, by correspondent Tatyana Chemodanova.

Voloshin says the society's aim is to raise the prestige of the Armed Forces, to strengthen the unity of the Army and the people, and to promote Army reforms. The newly formed society will make television and radio programs, as well as video and audio products, mainly

for service units and ships and cable television organizations. The society has been set up by representatives of the USSR Defense Ministry, the USSR State Committee for Television and Radio Broadcasting [gosteleradio], and public organizations.

Asked whether the society, known as radar, will engage in commercial activity, Voloshin says: "Today, with the transition to the market, including the transformation of Gosteleradio to commercial and economic management activity, we also envisage commercial activity." It will not engage in advertising. Voloshin says he does not approve of it. However, it will seek to promote a positive attitude toward the Armed Forces.

Voloshin says that Radar will make television and radio programs. He hopes that they will soon be on the air and that they will prove popular.

Zalygin Challenges Literary Paper's Claim

91UN0488 Moscow LITERATURNAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian No 48, 30 Nov 90 p 4

[Report on USSR Writers Union plenum in Moscow on 22 November and speech by Sergey Zalygin, NOVYY MIR editor in chief: "The Plenum of the USSR Writers Union"]

[Text] The seventh plenum of the USSR Writers Union is over. The plenum participants were supposed to discuss and adopt resolutions on two issues: "On the Draft Declaration of the USSR Writers Union's Renewal" and "The Status of the USSR Writers Union's Publishing activities." The report on the first item on the agenda was presented by Yu. Surovtsev, secretary of the USSR Writers Union board. He commented on the main aspects of the draft, which had been distributed among the participants in advance. What shape the writers association will take (a union, a federation, or a confederation) will be decided on the next all-Union writers congress; meanwhile, the plenum participants adopted the draft as a basis.

The plenum confirmed A. Prokhanov's appointment as editor in chief of DEN newspaper.

The second issue was presented by V. Karpov, first secretary of the USSR Writers Union board, and caused stormy debates. As is known, some working collectives of Writers Union publications have made themselves "self-appointed founders" of their publications. These actions did not find wide support among the writers' community: More than 3,000 writers out of the 4,000 polled considered such a decision by, for instance, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, unjustified. A frenzied attempt to work out a compromise solution that would satisfy both the writers and the LITERATURNAYA GAZETA collective had not succeeded. The plenum atmosphere, especially after V. Lichutin's speech, became explosive, with emotions taking over reason. The secretariat of the USSR Writers Union board decided that to continue the session under such circumstances would be impossible. The plenum

wrapped up its work prematurely, without passing a resolution on the second issue.

Among those participating in the post-presentation debates were: V. Pavlov, S. Zalygin, V. Sokolov, K. Akhmetov, N. Gorbachev, B. Romanov, Al. Mikhaylov, and others. On the second day of the plenum, a letter from V. Karpov was read, and V. Rasputin, Ye. Yevtushenko, S. Zalygin, and A. Agabayev addressed the plenum participants.

Without lengthy commentary, the editors believe it useful to give the readers an opportunity to acquaint themselves with S. Zalygin's speech on the first day of the plenum, which, in our view, reflects the atmosphere of the plenum, and Vl. Gusev's impressions, which we reprint from the MOSKOVSKIY LITERATOR newspaper of 23 November 1990 [not processed].

[Signed] Department of Literary Life and Information

Sergey Zalygin: "When No Facts Are Presented"

We live in such frightening environment that we cannot find our place in it. Perhaps, we not so much come closer to the coordinates in which we should exist as day by day we move away from them. We are encountering the fact that the word is losing its meaning. For instance, I speak up in the press and say: This man is a state criminal. This does not mean anything. The criminal goes on with his life. He continues to ruin the environment, just as before, and he is adapting to the conditions of perestroika, gaining more from it than those who initiated it or those who truly support it.

Under these circumstances the Writers Union, all of us, have not set the best example. In many respects it is our own fault. I know many writers in the republics who started the nationalist movement themselves, and now they have moved away from it. Because they themselves, the initiators, did not foresee such a turn of events and what it would come to.

Now we are saying: Let us consolidate. How? We have to search for something. What do we have left? In ourselves, in each of us, and in all of us together—if not as members of the same union, then at least as members of the same profession.

What we are saying is declaration by declaration. A declaration is a very simple thing. There is nothing easier than to declare something. But a declaration, even a good one, is not binding. A declaration is not a program; it does not specify any course of action. It only defines a goal. That we can do very well—we have been defining things beautifully and flawlessly for 73 years. What are the results?

We are being consumed by terrible factionalism. This factionalism is frightening. I do not see here today many of my comrades, Muscovites with whom I have had a good relationship for decades. I perceive this fact—that they are not here today—as a kind of personal insult.

What has happened that we cannot even meet in the same room? On the other hand, there is also a moral underpinning to this whole matter that makes it possible to hurl accusations at the group of very major writers, because one gets the impression that they have received all the benefits the union can give, and they do not need the union any more. It may be interpreted that way, too.

I think that the apotheosis of our disagreements was LITERATURNAYA GAZETA breaking up with the union. There is nothing to add to this. I think that two groups have emerged as a result of this. On the one hand, there is LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, on the other, our secretariat, and they deserve each other. I am responsible for this, too. I am a member of the bureau that did not take place. Therefore, some burden of responsibility rests with me, too. But right now this is not the point. I think that both LITERATURNAYA GAZETA and the union have been very petty about this whole thing. The Union fell for this bait—the pettiness. Who said what and when. You see, this kind of gathering should not discuss this kind of petty thing. We should have discussed the legal side of this matter. Who is right, who is wrong? Without this we will not decide anything anyway.

There is also another question which has completely fallen out of the scope of discussion. Why did LITERATURNAYA GAZETA “separate?” What were their motives? Where did they explained it all to us? They say they are under pressure. What kind? When? Where are the facts?

I am an editor myself. I know from my own experience that the union has not stood in anybody’s way. I must even say that at some difficult moments—for instance, when we were discussing the possibility of publishing Solzhenitsyn—the union supported us. But I do have serious doubts that it had stood in anybody’s way.

Therefore, before the split, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA should have presented proof of such pressure that made its life unbearable. They have not.

Therefore, if that factor was absent, what motives moved LITERATURNAYA GAZETA? What remains is the second part of this movement, that is, mercantile considerations.

LITERATURNAYA GAZETA now presents the Writers Union and its leadership with a host of financial questions: How much have they spent here and there? In my view, at this point they do not even have the right to ask these questions since they are no longer members of the union. It is no longer their business to ask these questions.

Besides, LITERATURNAYA GAZETA itself does not make public what kind of salaries they pay and what they are hoping to gain from their split from the union.

I emphasize the financial side of the matter because, at first glance, there is no other proof. LITERATURNAYA GAZETA has conducted its gambit in the best traditions

of high-level apparatus games. A public-editorial council was created. Who was invited to join this council? Only those who had been known in advance to support LITERATURNAYA GAZETA’s move.

So this council gathers and votes (my comrades and my close friends are members of that council; I do not agree with them; I have even sent a telegram informing them of my resignation from that council), what for?—for value judgments, etc. But why, if this council was created before the newspaper split with the Writers Union, why did the council not discuss this cardinal issue? Why is LITERATURNAYA GAZETA writing now that the council was created in compliance with the rules.... Excuse me! It was created much earlier. Then we see a real high-wire act—a plenum of the public-editorial council is called. What plenum? Who elected this plenum? If LITERATURNAYA GAZETA wanted to stay with the writers’ community, why did not they go to the Literary Fund? Why?

So, here is the final layout: the Literary Fund gets 35 percent. This is not a document, this is an indulgence signed by Comrade Gorbachev. Forty-five percent goes to the state, and 20 or 25 percent remains with LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. Why? Why 20 percent? Who has decided that? Why should the 10,000-member Writers Union get 35 percent, and 10 members of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA editorial staff get 20 percent? They should come out and explain this. Maybe they will convince me. But they do not even consider it necessary to come here.

There are grudges on the part of the union. I have my own personal grudge. Forgive my language, but I also got a “kick in the butt,” because those 62.5 million that LITERATURNAYA GAZETA claims as its capital, earned over the years, I have earned those millions for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, too.... (Voice from the audience: Right!) I worked for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA for 40 years; then new people came, worked there for a year or two, and now they are the owners, and I am not? I will not accept crumbs from Comrade Burlatskiy’s table. (applause)

We should research this issue, and I think that if we can make a legal claim (and we do have such right) against LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, we should do so. There were 370 votes for letting LITERATURNAYA GAZETA go, and 3,170 against. That is 3,170 people who have demanded their share in LITERATURNAYA GAZETA equity, not because they need this money, but because we cannot be treated that way. (From the audience: This is a start-up equity.)

That is precisely the point. Now Comrade Burlatskiy will distribute this money. Have I conferred this right on him? Besides, let me assure you that he himself will not last there. There will be Comrade Shchekochikhin, or some other, instead. Burlatskiy is a temporary figure who is being used right now. (From the audience: He is just a rookie in the union as well.)

That is not the point. Let us not get overwhelmed by emotions. I have given in to emotions a little, and I now regret it.

I want to repeat, however. Today we have this plenum. Is it an event in literary life? Yes, it is. Where are we going to write about it? There is no place. How can this be? We should have been given a least a grace period. "We want to split!" This is a slap in our face. Our working secretariat has given up too soon (applause) in the face of LITERATURNAYA GAZETA's demands, by founding DEN. This is not going to help those who oppose the split. By doing this we have conceded defeat. This should not be done. (From the audience: We need an extraordinary congress.)

After LITERATURNAYA GAZETA announced its split, we should have called a plenum and resolved these problems the very next day. If we were to go to court, we should have gone there with the minutes of such a plenum. Not afterward. (From the audience: It is still not too late to go to court.)

Court Case Over Journal ZNAMYA Described

91UN0519A Moscow LITERATURNAYA GAZETA
in Russian No 51, 19 Dec 90 p 2

[Article by Irina Rishina: "Passions over Founding, or in Whose Hands is 'ZNAMYA'?"]

[Text] *The Moscow City Court rejected the suit of the USSR Writers Union.* If we are to speak frankly, the judgment delivered by the Moscow City Court—to reject the suit of the USSR Writers Union—could have been foretold with a great degree of probability, it seemed to me, immediately after the first explanations of the plaintiff. Nonetheless, it took several days to hear the case, and this is quite understandable inasmuch as there has never before been this sort of precedent in judicial practice—for the USSR Writers Union filed claims regarding the registration of the journal ZNAMYA, whose founder was the editorial work collective. The gist of the statement: To declare invalid the registration accomplished by the Russian Ministry of the Press and Mass Media, and to make it incumbent upon the USSR Goskompechat [State Committee for the Press] to register the journal in the name of the Writers Union; that is, to return it to the rank of a departmental publication, under the aegis of the Writers Union, to which, beginning its existence in 1931 as LOKAF (Literary Association of the Red Army and Navy), it was assigned by a party resolution in 1934 when the Union of Soviet Writers was formed. In the interval between meetings, journalists said sarcastically: It is said that in stagnant times the Writers Union arranged trials against authors and manuscripts, and that now it decided to subordinate this journal forcefully to itself—is this not stagnation of perestroika in the making? But one way or another the judgment of the court had a fundamental significance, and it is not without reason that Professor M. Fedotov, RSFSR deputy minister of the press and mass media,

began in this way: "The case that is being examined today is unique—it is the first USSR Law on the Press case in court, and how its practical application evolves will depend on the kind of judgment that is handed down. Therefore, today's decision can rightfully be called portentous.... I will not dwell on the fact that the Writers Union has had an absolute monopoly on the country's literary press for more than five decades. Now, naturally, it is trying to preserve its monopoly. But times have changed. The Law on the Press makes it possible if not to end, then in any cases to seriously shake, the unlimited authority of the former bosses of our press. The bridles of legal bondage are being severed. There are more and more independent publications. Meanwhile, it became known in court that the USSR Writers Union sent a letter to the USSR Goskompechat which reported its intentions to register 17 literary publications as its own. But LITERATURNAYA GAZETA, ZNAMYA, DRUZHBA NARODOV, YUNOST, INOSTRANAYA LITERATURA, and others preferred independence.

Yu. Chernichenko, secretary of the USSR Writers Union board, spoke rather definitively on this matter: "There is no doubt whatsoever that the journal ZNAMYA must transfer resources to the Literary Fund, which is required to assist writers materially. Exactly the same for LITERATURNAYA GAZETA as well. Financially, I agree, but in a creative respect the order is simply ruled out. Otherwise, why did we adopt the Law on the Press?" But the ZNAMYA collective has repeatedly declared specifically about the fact that it will allocate money to the Literary Fund without fail.

I am confident that it would be more interesting reading if LITERATURNAYA GAZETA printed more or less a full deciphering of the 10 tape recordings imprinted with the subjects, abrupt changes, and nuances of the court hearing of the case. For example, the startling unpreparedness and helplessness of the representative of the plaintiff, lawyer A. Voronov, who did not even know such preliminary data as the fact that the ZNAMYA editorial staff never received anything from the Writers Union (premises, pay, bonuses—everything was given by the PRAVDA publishing house), and that it never made any allocations from profits either to the Writers Union or to the Literary Fund (they went to the same publishing house). On the next day, S. Kolov, the well-informed acting secretary of the board, came to the rescue of the lawyer. Later, V. Karpov, the first secretary of the board of the Writers Union, who had just returned the day before from Cairo, was called to court. There and then came the culmination point that laid bare the source and the main motive for the actions of the journal—"separatist." The question was asked: "Vladimir Vasilyevich, what do you think, why were you as the first secretary of the board of the USSR Writers Union unable to reach a compromise decision with the collective of the ZNAMYA journal?" V. Karpov: "Because it did not want to, and fears were expressed that, after becoming the founder, the Writers Union would squeeze

and apply pressure and force some of its own positions and ambitions on the editorial staff. Baklanov says: But, so, while you are working, do not interfere.... If they do not elect you, someone else will come, and they will start to cut off our oxygen. I proposed: NOVYY MIR has a good version. NOVYY MIR also feared such a possibility and registered itself with the Literary Fund. It is impossible to unite the USSR Writers Union on an ideological level. It has split into two camps, a fight is going on, and I understand that it is impossible to paste them together. So on a simple and everyday level, I tried to support the unity of the Writers Union so that they would be well-fed, be able to write and work, and so that they would be able, as the saying goes, 'to feed their children.'" Judge V. Yemisheva: "But if the Literary Fund is a cofounder of ZNAMYA, what will this change?" V. Karpov: "The money will go to the writers." V. Yemisheva: "What kind of money? It is not being received now, and it was not being received previously."

It is natural that G. Baklanov, editor in chief of the journal ZNAMYA, returned to the "hot" question in his appearance: "The first secretary has repeated several times: The union has split. To whom, properly speaking, would the journal ZNAMYA belong in such a situation? I did not learn from him what guarantees we would have if we all of a sudden decided to assume as founder a Union that is splitting and disintegrating, or a structure still dependent on it—the Literary Fund. If the situation with the Literary Fund also changes—then what? The idea is being peddled all the time that the journal is in the hands of 24 persons, but the Writers Union has 10,000 persons. This is not in keeping with our morality, said Voronov. But, you see, the fact is that 10,000 persons do not edit the journal. And 19 million party members do not edit the newspaper PRAVDA. There always are specific people who do the work. And it was not 10,000 members of the Writers Union who first published Plato, or 'A Dog's Heart,' or Pristavkin's story 'A Little Gold Cloud Stayed for the Night'—all the journals rejected it, but we published it; meanwhile all the directive organs at the time attacked us in any way they could, but we said: It will be published. And we published it. Not all of our authors by any means belong to the Writers Union. There are famous ones, and young ones, and those who ended up emigrating—whether they are members of the Writers Union or not—our journal is always open to talented writers. The editorial collective assembled this morning once again, and we affirmed: Yes, we are ready to conclude an agreement with the Literary Fund, to allocate money from profits, and to help men of letters who are in need."

The claims of the USSR Writers Union were rejected by the Moscow City Court. Next in turn is the suit regarding LITERATURNAYA GAZETA. Who is next after that?

First Edition of New Paper Appears in Moscow

LD2212065990 Moscow Domestic Service
in Russian 0430 GMT 22 Dec 90

[Summary] The first edition of NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA [INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER], founded

several months ago by the Moscow soviet, has appeared in Moscow. The new paper is not the organ of anyone, including its founder. At first, the newspaper will appear three times a week in Moscow. Soon it will become a national weekly, accessible to all in the USSR. Its objective is to provide information from a common democratic position on the political life of the country and world without the removal of any facts or figures.

New Newspaper Started in Leningrad

LD0501063891 Moscow Domestic Service in Russian
0200 GMT 5 Jan 91

[Summary] In Leningrad a new newspaper, NEVSKOYE VREMYA [NEVA TIMES], has started to come out. Radio correspondent Matvey Frolov interviewed Yuriy Mikhaylovich Kirillov, editor in chief of this newspaper, who says the newspaper is to have wider coverage than just Leningrad events and is completely independent of the Leningrad city soviet. It is being published jointly with the northwestern branch of NOVOSTI. The newspaper has 50,000 subscribers. Its initial edition will be 200,000 copies.

New Leningrad, Moscow Papers Published

LD2312021990 Moscow Domestic Service
in Russian 1300 GMT 22 Dec 90

[Text] In kiosks of Soyuzpechat of the capital, the first copies of NEZAVISIMAYA GAZETA [INDEPENDENT NEWSPAPER] have appeared. It was founded by Moscow Soviet several months ago. Soon it will be a daily nationwide political newspaper. We can add that a new newspaper has come from Leningrad. It is called ANICHKOV MOST [ANICHKOV BRIDGE]. It is named after the bridge on Nevskiy Prospekt located in the center of the district of architectural monuments. Writing in the first edition of the newspaper is Academician Likhachev, chairman of the Soviet cultural fund.

New Intellectual Weekly Published

LD2012164490 Moscow World Service
in English 0810 GMT 20 Dec 90

[Excerpt] The first edition of an independent weekly called RUSSKIY KURYER has come out. The English version would be Russian Courier. It is founded by the international association of intellectuals in support of perestroyka and glasnost. The weekly will also be published in Paris and New York. [passage omitted: political observer reviews history of USSR since beginning of perestroyka in 1985]

400 Publishing Houses in Operation

LD2212103390 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 0401 GMT 22 Dec 90

[Text] A TASS correspondent has been told by Svyatov, the deputy head of the Department for the Coordination of Publishing of the USSR State Printing Committee,

that almost three hundred books and magazine publishing houses are officially operating in the country. If newspapers are included, the total increases to about 400.

Altay Kray, Soviets Dispute Over Newspaper

*PM1312132590 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
12 Dec 90 Union Edition p 2*

[Margarita Kurgalina report under the "Direct Line" rubric: "How the Editor Was Sacked"]

[Text] Barnaul—A paradoxical situation has developed at ALTAYSKAYA PRAVDA [Altay Truth]—the kray newspaper has two editors.

One editor was elected by an organizational plenum of the CPSU kraykom [kray committee], but the newspaper is still signed by another—A. Mishin, who was appointed by the kray soviet's session. Does the newspaper have two founders and two editors?

The news has brought the kray's public to a state of turmoil. Many readers perceive the alternative elections as an attempt by the CPSU kraykom apparatus to regain its monopoly on glasnost. They base their appraisal of events on the Law on the Press, whereas the plenum participants were guided exclusively by a paragraph of the CPSU Statute.

Furthermore, the decision to hold elections was made in breach of the editorial board's charter, that says candidates for the office of editor are suggested to the founder by the journalists' labor collective. The organizers of the action not only failed to consult the newspaper's staff, but did not even notify them of it. And even the actual formula of alternative elections was extremely sly. There are no reasons to formally dismiss A. Mishin from office: The readers have voted for the newspaper with their rubles—the subscription campaign proved successful for the editorial board, despite the higher price per issue.

It remains to be seen what decision will be made by the deputies to whom ALTAYSKAYA PRAVDA's collective has appealed.

Economic

Incomplete Construction Projects' Sale Proposed

*PM1001112991 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
8 Jan 91 Union Edition p 1*

[Report by I. Demchenko: "Our Buildings Are Being Sold"]

[Text] Documents have been prepared by the USSR Ministry of Finance and submitted to the USSR Council of Ministers defining the procedure for the sale of

incomplete construction projects to foreign entrepreneurs. In the opinion of USSR Finance Minister V. Pavlov, this will lead to an improvement in money-finance circulation.

The volume of incomplete construction work in 1990, in the opinion of specialists, will be markedly in excess of the volume of capital investment. Moreover, it is construction funded by enterprises that has accounted for the bulk of the increase in incomplete construction projects over the last two years. Unfortunately, hopes that, having received the possibility of managing their own resources, collectives would become more spend-thrift, have not been justified. The old mentality was evidently operating: The main point is to lay the foundations, and then somehow... But "somehow" this did not work. Now, even if they refrained entirely from new building projects, they would need a minimum of five years to finish under their own steam the projects that have already been started.

The Ministry of Finance proposes to attract foreign capital and material resources for the completion of our "foundations" by selling facilities through auctions and sales by tender. In both cases, both Soviet and foreign enterprises, organizations, and citizens may take part in the competition for the right to become possessors [obladateli] of incomplete construction projects, but it is proposed that sales by tender be conducted only in hard currency, while auctions be conducted in both rubles and hard currency. In both cases, in accordance with world practice, bank credit can be used.

In the opinion of specialists, the objects of sales can include not only suspended or mothballed projects for civilian housing or industrial purposes, but also the equipment therein, whether installed or not (according to one draft, even equipment which is kept in manufacturer's warehouses), as well as the planning estimates. The land on which the construction site is situated cannot be sold. The conditions under which a future proprietor will receive the right to enjoy possession of land plots will, according to all appearances, be determined by local soviets.

It is interesting that both documents feature the concept of "proprietor" [vladelets] or "seller" of an incomplete construction project, but neither document clearly mentions the owner [sobstvennik]. Frankly unwilling to get involved in this delicate problem, USSR Ministry of Finance specialists have skirted round it, deciding to share the profits generated from sales of incomplete construction projects in proportion to the contributions made from budgets to fund planning and construction work. At the same time the Foreign Currency Administration proposes to class as proprietors' revenue only the ruble equivalent of the proceeds, while hard currency funds are channeled to meet state needs.

Manager Warns of Serious Supply Shortfalls

914A0267A Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 4 Jan 91 First Edition p 2

[Interview with O. Meshcheryakov, general director of the Pendizelmash industrial association, by V. Kovalev; place and date not given: "The Director's Thoughts: Using Theory as a Crowbar"]

[Text] Heavy machine building includes 700 enterprises. The most authoritative administrators from 120 of these enterprises were recently invited to participate in a conference of our industry's top brass. These people selected O. Meshcheryakov, general director of the Pendizelmash industrial association, to express from the Kremlin podium their views on the industry's problems and on the measures needed to overcome the economic crisis. Later, he was interviewed by our correspondent.

[Kovalev] Oleg Nikolayevich, enough time has passed since the "directors conference." What was the main thing on your mind when you returned to your enterprise?

[Meshcheryakov] The same thing that was there when I went to Moscow—great concern, and it is not subsiding. Judge for yourself. At the conference First Deputy Premier L. Voronin called on us to increase the volume of production by two to three percent. We, the directors of heavy machine building enterprises, are ready to do that. But give us the raw materials! Meanwhile, next year our industry will have, for instance, only enough pipes to fulfill half of the production program. The state order has fallen 450,000 tons short of rolled iron. We knew all of that before the conference, and L. Voronin should know these facts, too. Naturally, we had hoped to hear how things would be improved. Instead, we only got a bare slogan: Increase! With what resources?

[Kovalev] Can this metal not be purchased on the open market?

[Meshcheryakov] We would gladly do that. However, according to Gosstab [State Committee for Material and Technical Supply], of 12,600 tons of metal expected to be available for sale, the Ministry of Metallurgy will take 6,600 tons for its own repair and maintenance needs, and the rest will be distributed in its entirety between the Ministry of the Coal Industry, the Ministry of Energy, and other raw materials industries. So much for our market for now. Therefore, we can already say today with a fair degree of certainty that, because of this metal deficit, the enterprises in our industry, much as they would like to meet next year's state order, will fall at least 15 percent short.

[Kovalev] So what is the way out?

[Meshcheryakov] I am convinced, and so are my colleagues, that what is needed for the transition period is an immediate ban on sales of raw materials for hard currency and through direct contracts, and to restrict sale of raw materials to cooperatives to only those materials

left after the needs of state enterprises have been met. Please understand me correctly. I am not a staid conservative; I am not against a mixed economy. But we, the producers, have to deal with real life, not office-born theories, no matter how pretty they look on paper. And the reality is this: There is a serious danger that because of aluminum shortages our association will shut down, leaving tens of thousands of people out of work.

At the same time I know for a fact that aluminum, nearly every gram of which is grabbed for when it is distributed among state enterprises, is freely available for sale abroad and almost without limit. In the end, we need to come to terms with ourselves: What is it that we want? If the task is to finally undermine and destroy the state sector of the economy while masking the collapse with the din of market talk, we are going in that direction, and we should continue acting this way. But it would be good to ask the workers first what they want.

[Kovalev] Frankly, I was surprised by the discord in the speeches by two deputy premiers: L. Voronin and L. Abalkin. One called for an increase in production by two to three percent, while the other immediately declared that the volume of production actually is expected to decrease. How do you explain this to yourself?

[Meshcheryakov] I wish I only had to explain it to myself! Let us recall the presidential decree on stabilizing economic ties. This decree demands a 100-percent fulfillment of previous contractual obligations for delivery of raw materials, supplies, and components. What is the result? The factories for which we produce parts receive quantities—as specified by the decree—that exceed their actual needs, so they start selling our products, raking in unearned profits.

But this is just the beginning. The point is that the volume of deliveries specified in contractual obligations for 1990—the fulfillment of which the presidential decree insists on—is substantially greater than the state order. At the same time, in accordance with the government directive, Gosstab and Gosplan [State Planning Commission] ensure only the state order. They do not provide support for stabilization of economic ties in general. However, the presidential decree, as everybody understands, was also prepared by the government.

So what do we have? It seems that the right hand does not know what the left is doing. Where does this leave the director, and with him, the whole workers collective? I think, the presidential decree needs to be amended urgently so that mandatory deliveries will not exceed 80 percent of the level already achieved. I am certain that this proposal will find support among the overwhelming majority of industry administrators.

[Kovalev] There was not much criticism of presidential decrees at the Kremlin conference, though.

[Meshcheryakov] Let me put it this way: Not everybody who wanted to speak had the chance to do so. I myself, despite the fact that I was among the first people to

submit a request to speak, nearly had to fight my way to the podium by the end of the conference. But, notwithstanding what could and could not be discussed at the conference, there are things that, as they say, cry out for divine justice. Here is one example. At the beginning of this year the government, literally twisting the arms of the industry administrators, forced them to accept the plan for production of consumer goods with the built-in 70 percent increase. Everybody understands that this plan is absolutely unrealistic. It is not supported either by raw materials or by available equipment. There was nothing but emptiness behind it.

This is an example of pure voluntarism. Many directors were not in a hurry to salute. I held back as long as I could, too. Still, eventually we had to tackle this impossible task. We found enough intrafactory reserves to create an additional 3,000 square meters of production area. But, of course, it was clear before we even started that it was impossible to produce a 70 percent increase.

Then in November—a thunder from clear skies. A presidential decree is published, and it says that enterprises that did not meet the goals have to pay penalties, out of enterprise's profits, equal to one half of the cost of the undelivered consumer goods. For us it meant a 1.5 million ruble loss. For this money—earned the hard way, by honest labor—we could have built a building with 100 apartments for our workers. Every fourth worker is on the waiting list to improve his living conditions. Now we cannot build this housing. But it is not our workers' fault. What am I going to tell them?

[Kovalev] Do you have to report to the collective often?

[Meshcheryakov] I speak twice a week on the factory radio network. Any worker may ask me a question without giving his name or the shop where he works. And I have noticed that there is a growing group of people who insistently ask the same question: Which presidential decrees and government decisions are aimed at increasing the workers' well-being?

To be honest, I have a hard time answering this question.

[Kovalev] What would you suggest?

[Meshcheryakov] I think we should not forget a simple truth: It is the enterprise where the national wealth is created. Only very nearsighted people can afford to endlessly push the enterprises into the corner and make them kneel time after time. As to my suggestions, I think that it is necessary to repeal all limitations on wages, as well as the provision requiring that labor productivity increases should exceed increases in wages. All of the this should be left to enterprises to decide.

[Kovalev] At the industry conference the president asked one of the speakers his opinion on the administrative structure...

[Meshcheryakov] In my opinion, the ministries, in their old form, have outlived themselves. This does not mean that they have to be liquidated. Not at all! They should

start a new life by acquiring functions that are performed now by Gossnab, Goskomtsen [State Committee on Prices], and Goskomtrud [State Committee for Labor and Social Problems]. Gosstandart [State Committee for Standards] should remain, but only to deal with international standards and the ship registry. The industry could be revived quickly and could get back on its feet if the ministries got involved in investments, price formation, financing of applied science, material supply and distribution, and took control of contracts and deliveries. They should have their own banks, too.

By the way, an attempt to create a commercial bank of the Ministry of Heavy Machine Building is underway now. In short, our ministries should resemble Western companies like General Motors. This method has been used for a long time, and successfully, throughout the world. There is no need for us to reinvent the wheel and to create unknown monstrosities such as the Ministry of Economics. I am not alone in thinking this; the overwhelming majority of my colleagues think the same.

[Kovalev] Do you have any certainty at all that your opinion will be taken into account?

[Meshcheryakov] Of course not. Just as there is no certainty that tomorrow there will not be another presidential decree that will make our administrators wring their hands in despair.

[Kovalev] Why do presidential decrees, to put it mildly, not elicit enthusiasm among industry administrators?

[Meshcheryakov] Because these decrees, as well as government directives, are written by the same people. These people, even if they once knew how metal shavings smell, have completely forgotten it by now. They have not looked into workers' eyes for eons. "The theory is dry, my friend..." Everywhere else theory is tested in practice. Here, on the contrary, practice is tested for durability by theory, which is used like a crowbar.

Therefore we do not need the Council of Ministers' industrial council; we need the presidential directors' council. This council should give preliminary consideration to planned presidential decrees. Only then would there be a hope that these decrees would be supported by the workers as if they were their own. Believe me, all of us need this very much.

Foreign Travel Expected To 'Drop Sharply'

PM1001124191 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
9 Jan 91 Union Edition p 1

[From roundup of IZVESTIYA, INTERFAX, REUTERS, POSTFACTUM, UPI, and SIBINFORM reports: "Results of 'Intourist' Activities in 1990"]

[Text] Vladimir Malinin, general director of the "Intourist" All-Union Joint-Stock Company, has reported that approximately 600,000 Soviet citizens traveled abroad

in 1990, including approximately 500,000 to East European countries. This figure is expected to fall sharply in the future due to the change in the procedure for settling accounts with socialist countries. Contracts for visits by more than 1 million people in 1991 have so far been signed with foreign firms.

"Intourist" intends to work with allied organizations on the basis of contract relations. It is proposed that accounts will be settled with them in currency so as to enhance the interest of all involved in serving tourists.

Food Combines Must Share Blame for Blocked Shipments

PM1912171790 Moscow IZVESTIYA in Russian
18 Dec 90 Union Edition p 1

[Report by I. Taburyanskaya "from the Ministry of Railways" under the "Direct Line" rubric: "Do the Meat Processing and Packaging Combines Need Meat?"]

[Text] On Sunday 16 December, 1,766 food cars stood idle at railroad stations around the country, waiting to be unloaded.

The current food situation would seem to demand that everything be registered, transported, unloaded, and put onto the counter with the minimum of delay. But in the Ministry of Railways operational reports on unloading work, the lists of defaulters take up several pages. The recommended time for unloading a refrigerated section (i.e. four cars) is five hours, yet at many enterprises it is considered routine for a car to stand idle for several days.

Many enterprises in the capital, as the addressees of the refrigerator car-loads of meat standing in the various stations around Moscow, are setting poor examples in this respect. The Ostankino Meat Processing Combine is expecting 98 cars, the Moskovskiy Meat Processing and Packing Combine—48, the Cherkizovo Meat Processing Plant—36, and Cold Storage Combines No. 14 and No. 12—23 and 14 cars respectively. Many have been waiting to be unloaded since the beginning of December.

Here are just a few examples from other cities. Four car-loads of beetroot for the oblast union of consumer societies grocery store have been standing at the Barkhatnaya station on the Far Eastern railway since 6 December. A car destined for the "Appelak" cooperative has been standing at the station in Rybniki waiting to be claimed for nearly a month now. Seven car-loads of flour and salt have been languishing in Pskov for two weeks....

We often give extraordinary reasons for the present-day chaos: sabotage, mafia conspiracy. Whether or not they are true is up to the competent authorities to judge. But are they really the only ones empowered to find out why food cargoes are being unloaded so wretchedly even when the overall volume of food being transported has not increased?

Russian City Developing Commodity Market

PM1001112591 Moscow SOVETSKAYA ROSSIYA
in Russian 8 Jan 91 First Edition p 1

[Report by correspondent A. Pyatunin: "Helping Business People"]

[Text] Voronezh—A commodity market is beginning to operate in Voronezh. Its main functions include intermediary services in the sale, exchange, and purchase of wholesale consignments of production and technical output, raw materials, consumer goods, and agricultural produce. The market also organizes permanent marts and auctions and provides information and advertising services.

While organizing and regulating cooperation between buyers and sellers across the Central-Chernozem Economic Region, the Voronezh commodity market will study market conditions and develop information ties with a network of similar institutions in our country and abroad. This will enable its partners to complete satisfactory trade deals with the minimum of financial risk.

State, lease, joint, and private enterprises, organizations, and associations and unions of collective farms, cooperatives, and small enterprises can become members of the market.

Publisher Transfers to Joint Stock Company

LD2912184790 Moscow TASS in English 1709 GMT
29 Dec 90

[Text] Moscow December 29 TASS—Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, the Soviet Union's largest association that specializes on the export and import of printed matter, has been transformed into a joint-stock company. This was decided at a constituent conference held in Moscow.

"Many staff members of the new organisation became its shareholders, along with Soviet enterprises, banks and institutions," its chairman of the board Stanislav Ostapishin told TASS. "Our sphere of activities is expanding. All that is connected with the export and import of books, periodicals and other printed matter will remain in the focus of our attention".

Specialists believe that the transition to a market-based system will be a difficult undertaking for the new joint-stock company, which is also called Mezhdunarodnaya Kniga, like its predecessor. It informed the editors of Soviet newspapers and magazines that it would not be able to deliver periodicals abroad by air. Up till now their export was financed from the state budget. There will be no subsidies next year. There are other serious problems, which are the results of a shortage of freely convertible currency.

"The legacy of the past is a heavy burden, but at the same time we should not reject the positive experience accumulated during 67 years of the association's existence. We employ hundreds of highly skilled specialists, we

maintain business contacts with 1,000 firms from 140 countries. We hope that the freedom of enterprise that we have acquired, as well as new forms of business relations will enable us to overcome current difficulties," Ostapishin said.

Menatep Bank Sells Investment Shares to Public

*LD2712220190 Moscow TASS in English 2028 GMT
27 Dec 90*

[Text] Moscow December 27 TASS—Soviet buyers flocked to a Menatep Bank early today to acquire shares issued by the expanding Soviet Bank Association.

"Money should work, rather than lie in a stocking," Georgiy Vorobyov, chairman of the Commercial Innovation Bank for Scientific and Technical Progress, told TASS.

"Menatep has a vast potential in banking and its current capital prevents it from expanding," he said, explaining why the association decided to issue shares to the public.

Menatep was set up in 1986 as a mediator in scientific and technical projects. It started from 200,000 roubles and has now more than 40 commercial structures, including 18 banks, an investment and trade company, with a total capital of more than 200 million roubles. Its turnover in the past 12 months reached five billion roubles.

It is independent from the state, but was recently licensed by the USSR State Bank to manage hard currency accounts for organisations and individuals. It set up a financial company in Switzerland, has holdings in Budapest and Gibraltar and opened an office in Paris.

The issue of shares will help boost Menatep's trade house capital to 300 million roubles and the capital of the Menatep-invest Investment Company to 50 million.

The association offered shares of 500, 1,000 and 10,000 roubles with an annual dividend of no less than 12 per cent.

The money will be used to finance the building, light and food industries, modernise several heavy industries, for publishing activities and other innovation projects.

Joint Venture Showroom Opens in Moscow

*PM2612172990 Moscow PRAVDA in Russian
23 Dec 90 Second Edition p 8*

[TASS report: "'Inkومتreyd' in 'Moskva'"]

[Text] From coffee mills to satellite television antennas—such is the broad range of consumer goods on display at one of the departments in the capital's "Moskva" Department Store. A showroom was opened by the "Inkومتreyd" Joint Venture which has decided to make its contribution toward supplying our stores. Recently created with participation by partners from Austria, Italy, the United States, Finland, and the FRG,

this joint venture is now drawing up large-scale plans to open up the Soviet market by various means, including the opening of branches by numerous U.S. companies in the USSR.

"Our firm's business strategy," Deputy General Director S. Drobizhev told us, "was developed by California's 'Internet' Corporation headed by W. Halperin, the famous banking expert. In addition to trade in consumer goods samples for foreign currency and rubles, we are planning three levels of activity, right up to major investments in setting up new industrial enterprises."

Consumer, Defense Plants Urged To Share Expertise

*PM1912122190 Moscow Central Television First
Program Network in Russian 0930 GMT 17 Dec 90*

[Report by correspondents S. Vetoshkin and V. Privezentsev: from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] According to Academician Stanislav Shatalin the main problem is conversion, that is, the main problem in the transition to a market economy. However, the leaders of defense enterprises say that their enterprises must receive resources as before and that the centralized system of management must be retained. As is well-known, in accordance with the conversion program adopted 18 months ago, conversion is to embrace 400 enterprises under the control of the Ministry of the Defense Industry and 100 enterprises under other ministries. Critics of this program think that, if these enterprises are not released from centralized control and remain under the jurisdiction of orders from above, there will effectively be no increase in nonmilitary output.

[Correspondent] This is a model of a chassis component made of acrylic plastic, but the same items could be manufactured from high-tensile steel by tools at Vladimir's "Tekhnika" Production Association. Moreover, it can be done fully automatically and with a precision of up to five microns. With the start of conversion demand for this kind of equipment sharply declined in the country; the government failed to elaborate any measures to stimulate purchases of science-intensive equipment—yet look what the men of Vladimir now have to work on—multipurpose tools that were obsolete 20 years ago. Admittedly, there is one positive element in all this. Consumer goods production has sharply increased. But what kind of goods are we talking about?

[N.I. Dmitrev, chief engineer at the Ministry of the Aviation Industry's "Tekhnika" Production Association] Lathes used for domestic purposes—television stands, stainless steel, and bathroom fittings. You see, it's painful and insulting to use your brain, your technical and intellectual potential to produce consumer goods like these. If you look at the tools that we are manufacturing today, with a small change in technology and software we could produce different types of goods.

With these tools we can make components for vacuum cleaners, sewing machines, washing machines, coffee grinders, mixers, and various kinds of other domestic equipment.

[Correspondent] Especially since plants manufacturing this kind of equipment are generally very badly equipped.

[Dmitrev] That's the point. We could equip virtually any plant that produces consumer goods or domestic equipment. This would be several times more productive than the equipment these plants currently use.

[Correspondent] I think that there is a very great deal of common sense in this. If workers from enterprises producing domestic equipment are watching now, we could consider this discussion an invitation to cooperate. Isn't that right, Nikolay Ivanovich.

[Dmitrev] Quite right. We are now more interested in business partners than ever before.

Military

Reform of Disaster Rescue Arrangements Urged

PM1001152591 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 10 Jan 91 First Edition p 1

[Article by Rear Admiral M. Povedenok, deputy commander of the Northern Fleet for Civil Defense, under the "Soviets and Garrisons" rubric: "Have We Profited From the Bitter Lessons?"]

[Text] Chernobyl, Arzamas, Armenia... Today these names make up a kind of depressing geographic picture of the tragedies that shook our country in the past few years. And not so long ago there were more explosions, this time at the artillery depots of the Pacific Fleet. This bitter cup did not pass from Severomorsk, when the glow of a fire once rose above the arms depots.

It would seem that these bitter lessons should have convinced everyone by now that today no one is insured against such accidents that occur through human error or just naturally. Furthermore, experience shows that in such cases many casualties and much material damage could have been avoided if people capable of swiftly and professionally implementing a carefully prepared plan of measures as needed to ensure the safety of personnel and the population and to eliminate the consequences of the accident had combated these disasters. But the obviousness of the need for cardinal changes and recognition of their expediency is still no guarantee that the intended measures and plans will be carried out.

Several decades ago a system for basing Northern Fleet ships started being drawn up. At that time the main criterion was favorable geographic deployment, which was necessary for the speediest building work. What happened as a result? Today there are several basing facilities for nuclear submarines or ships in the Northern

Fleet. The living quarters are located either directly at the mooring or a just few kilometers away. At some basing facilities stores of armaments, fuels and lubricants, and other inflammable materials are within the boundaries of the living quarters. And all because the development of the camp infrastructures proceeds without taking into account the population's real safety. Over 180,000 people, around 30 percent of whom are children, live in such potentially dangerous garrisons in the North alone.

Unfortunately not a single person out of the 180,000 can be sure that, if there were some kind of accident, their safety would be guaranteed. Moreover, it has to be stated that the officials in local authorities who are supposed to provide this safety (civil defense chiefs and chiefs of staff) have practically avoided fulfilling their duties. There are numerous examples of this.

In the majority of potentially dangerous areas there is a lack of the necessary number of anti-radiation preparations. Even if some stocks have been built up, they are stored centrally and it would be impossible to use them in extreme conditions on time. There is a similar picture with the provision of individual protection facilities for the population. Even in Severomorsk—the Northern Fleet's capital—the local authorities have not bothered to supply the necessary quantity of gas masks, even for the children. Those that they do have are being stored in one single depot, and it would take around 12 hours to supply them if they were needed. If something happened on a day off or during the night, you would not be able to sort anything out—there would be no one on duty at the civil defense center, which is subordinate to the city authorities.

The permanent emergency commissions recently formed within the soviets are not doing the job either, because they are capable of establishing what has happened only after the event. And the whole burden of responsibility and the job of carrying out work to eliminate the consequences of an emergency, including protecting the civilian population, rests with the Fleet structures. This activity on the part of the emergency commission is quite understandable if you look at its planning group—which is the same collective "brain" that is supposed to predict all eventualities and emergency situations and form a plan of action for every option. There are all kinds of posts in this group: There is even an acting head of the cultural department and a chief accountant... But somehow they have forgotten to include specialists in it.

Obviously the state of affairs in civil defense must be urgently changed. There are possibilities for this. Well organized cooperation between the local garrison defense staff and the permanent emergency commission could be very beneficial here. Today in every garrison the local defense staffs are prepared to give assistance to the commissions in planning and elaborating joint action, providing facts and up-to-the-minute information to all types of intelligence, compiling unified working documents, and preparing nonstaff civil defense

formations. Fleet Command and garrison chiefs have frequently suggested that a single leadership staff be created to eliminate the consequences of emergency situations and even that protective equipment and means of communication be supplied for this purpose. And every time these proposals have gotten lost in the corridors of local organs. Is it worth waiting for the next bitter "lesson"?

Political Columnist Reacts to Yazov Broadcast

91UM0133A Moscow TRUD in Russian 30 Nov 90, p 2

[Article by N. Kishkin, TRUD political columnist: "The Minister of Defense Issues a Warning—D.T. Yazov Appeared on Central Television"]

[Text] Marshal D.T. Yazov's appearance Thursday evening's "Vremya" television program did not go unnoticed, especially because, as the minister of defense emphasized, it was made on the instructions of the USSR president. Just several days have passed, and already very different assessments can be heard—from full approval to complete disapproval. We will drop the extreme positions and try to conduct a level analysis.

The fact that the prestige of the Army has fallen in the country is no longer a secret to anyone. This is not the place to conduct a detailed analysis of why this has happened. And although the brass hats accuse an ill-intentioned press of everything, it seems that this explanation is too simple to be valid. The criticism of certain aspects of procedures established in the Army or of erroneous measures by Army leaders (which is completely normal in our democratic times) began to be interpreted as attacks on the Army in general, which only poured fuel on the fire. For failure to accept criticism has only one consequence—it makes the criticism more fierce.

This could be endured as long as it was only a matter of words. Unfortunately, certain excessively hot heads shifted to action, which no state can permit to happen. The wave of illegal actions with respect to the Army which unfolded in a number of republics creates a real threat to the defensive capability of the country. The establishment of Army subunits in opposition to the Armed Forces of the country, attacks on servicemen and military installations, official decisions of regional authorities on the redeployment of units [chast] and large units [soyedineniye], even those of a strategic designation—all of these are actual cases that, while satisfying someone's ambitions, have an impact on national interests. Naturally, the state authority does not have the right to remain silent under these conditions. Apparently, this is the one and only way that the statement by the minister of defense should be understood.

What kind of political density does one have to possess in order to raise the question of transferring nuclear weapons to the individual republics? Did the authors of such demands ponder the international consequences of such a step when the number of nuclear states on the

map will double and treble? Because this is playing with fire. Therefore, the official warning was quite timely: Under no circumstances will a parceling out of nuclear weapons be permitted. This is necessary not for the president, not for the minister, but, first and foremost, for all of us.

Precisely in the same way, if we want to be defended reliably, it is not up to a rayon soviet of people's deputies to decide whether a missile site should be in one place or another. The minister was compelled to declare that the Army will deploy itself where it is necessary for the security of the state.

A genuinely democratically inclined people will never excuse direct encroachments on soldiers, and this means that they will perceive with understanding the warning that the Army will undertake all legal measures to protect servicemen and members of their families. We have already repeatedly witnessed armed attacks on soldiers and officers, military facilities, and weapons depots. Afterward the weapons were fired at us. It is hardly likely that an army will be respected if it silently concurs in this or engages in endless admonitions. The instruction to employ weapons in such situations is entirely legal, and it must be assumed that it will cool the ardor of extremists who are destabilizing an already explosive situation. In any case, they are warned. It is equally difficult to question the right of the Army to take the life-support system under its protection, if some local leader took it into his head to turn off electric power or water to some unit. No one is allowed to toy with the security of the country.

The minister of defense also made another important announcement: The commanders of forces of districts and fleets were issued instructions not to permit acts of vandalism against the monuments and graves of Soviet soldiers. Attempts to erect monuments or in other ways to glorify fascists and their hirelings are perceived by all honorable people as blasphemy and an insult to our conscience and the memory of those who have fallen. Therefore, the intention to oppose this and to eliminate the already existing symbols of this kind are understandable. But it just seems that in each such case decisions should be made in political, not in Army, spheres. In order that, as the saying goes, nothing stupid is done. The use of force is a dangerous thing.

Better late than never—this is the way the report of the minister of defense is being received concerning the fact that the troops have been given instructions to take active measures to establish order in military units, precluding nonregulation behavior and violation of the military oath. Because such cases, which are by no means isolated, have been written about in the press for many years. Judging by everything, there was a need for intervention by the USSR president, to whom the Committee of Soldiers' Mothers appealed, in order that these signals are finally taken seriously. One would like to think that this will be followed by real efforts, and that

we will no longer hear instead reassuring words about "individual" and "atypical" cases.

Indeed, the statement of the minister of defense was harsh. But let us understand that the times required this: We can no longer condone the escalation of recklessness, hatred, and violence.

Military Reform Issue Raised by Rear Services

PM1812144390 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 15 Dec 90 First Edition p 6

[Report by P. Altunin: "Rear Services: Concerns of the Day"]

[Text] A gathering of leading personnel of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services has taken place at a base in the Carpathian Military District.

Urgent questions of rear services support for troops and naval forces under conditions of the current military reform and the complex situation in the country were raised in the report by Army General V. Arkhipov, USSR deputy defense minister and chief of the USSR Armed Forces Rear Services, and in the speeches by participants in the gathering—Comrades A. Klimov, G. Nikitin, A. Trepalin, N. Sadovnikov, A. Yermakov, V. Blokhin, and others.

Youth Armed Forces Propaganda Association Formed

PM1912112990 Moscow KRSNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 18 Dec 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by Captain V. Popov: "Association Instituted"]

[Text] Moscow—A conference of the youth association for the propaganda of the Soviet Armed Forces was held recently in the Large Auditorium of the USSR Armed Forces Central Museum.

Major S. Kalinin, staffer at the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, delivered a report containing thoughts on the main avenues of the activity of the new organization and the concept for its development.

The assembled delegates from the branches and categories of troops, districts, group of forces, fleets, and military academies spoke in the debates and elected a central council for the Association and an auditing commission.

Colonel General G. Stefanovskiy, deputy chief of the Main Political Directorate, and S. Golovin, secretary of the USSR Supreme Soviet Committee for Questions of Defense and State Security, took part in the work of the conference.

Military Academy Holds Humanitarian Law Seminar

LD1012173190 Moscow Radio Rossiya Network
in Russian 1230 GMT 10 Dec 90

[Excerpts] Military leaders have taken part in a seminar studying international humanitarian law at the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Academy. Henceforth, our military men will study the provisions of the Geneva Convention and the protocols to it, in order to know precisely when, during war time, one may fire at whom, and with what, and when one may not. This seminar was held after the Union defense minister ordered the Army guidelines documents to be brought into accord with the precepts of international humanitarian law.

A number of traditionally unshakeable notions inherited from the Russian Army and currently enshrined in the statutes of the Soviet Armed Forces, will most likely change: for instance, the article on the impossibility of surrender in any circumstances. Such a turn of events may probably soon be possible for a soldier on the battlefield in a number of situations. This is evoking a negative reaction from many military men, including veterans.

Foreign lawyers also took part in the seminar. They took an optimistic view. [passage omitted]

A USSR representative, lawyer Oleg Smolnikov took a more pessimistic view than his western colleagues. He described as the main weakness of international humanitarian law the fact that it does not try to ban wars as a phenomenon of civilization. One must, therefore, unfortunately admit that armed conflicts have by no means disappeared into oblivion, and will continue to occur.

General Interviewed on Seminar

LD0712223390 Moscow Central Television Vostok
Program and Orbita Networks in Russian 1530 GMT
7 Dec 90

[Interview with Major General L.G. Ivashov, head of administrative affairs at the USSR Ministry of Defense, by correspondent O. Bovin; place and date not given; from the "Vremya" newscast]

[Text] [Announcer] Human rights are, I think, one of the main topics that have been raised at international meetings of representatives from all over the world for many years now. This subject is especially topical now that the human rights of people in military uniform are also under discussion.

[Begin recording] [Bovin] This subject has been discussed at the academy of the General Staff. Leading specialists from abroad and top Army commanders took part in the discussion.

What is the main reason for holding such a seminar?

[Ivashov] Well, since the Soviet Union has recognized the primacy of international law, its principles should be

implemented. This is the main reason. It is not enough to proclaim these principles. They have to be carried out in practice. The holding of this seminar, the first one in the history of the Armed Forces, shows that the military really does take seriously the international commitments that our state makes, that it gives them priority, I would even say, and that it is prepared to implement them in practice.

[Bovin] What guidance are troops now being given about the law?

[Ivashov] About international law, about compliance with the principles of international law?

[Bovin] Yes, international law.

[Ivashov] Well, first of all, we have taken organizational steps. The Geneva Convention, and the additional protocols connected with it, now that they have been ratified by the USSR Supreme Soviet, have been brought into force in an order issued by the minister of defense, as practical guidance to troops on the application of the principles of international humanitarian law. This generally falls within the context of our military reform, one of those aspects is the introduction of more humane relationships in Soviet military service and the observance of human principles in our society as a whole. [end recording]

Chekov Remarks on Returning Troops' Housing

91UN0141A Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 2 Dec 90 First Edition p 2

[Interview with Colonel General N. Chekov, USSR deputy minister of defense for construction and billeting of troops, by I. Ivanyuk; place and date not given: "An Apartment on Their Native Land"]

[Text] Colonel General N. Chekov, USSR deputy minister of defense for construction and billeting of troops, talks about plans for accommodating the forces being withdrawn from Eastern Europe.

[Ivanyuk] Nikolay Vasilyevich, on the pages of KRASNAYA ZVEZDA 18 months ago you commented on the "Housing-2000" program that the Ministry of Defense had devised. Now, in conjunction with the withdrawal of units and subunits from the groups of forces I suppose that it is in need of updating.

[Chekov] Naturally. According to our calculations, the overall quantity of people without apartments in the Armed Forces will not be declining for about the next four years. For example, out of the Western Group of Forces we expect the arrival of about 77,000 families of officers and warrant officers who are not provided with housing on the territory of the USSR, and another 30,000 such families have been counted in the Central and Southern Groups of Forces, from which a withdrawal of troops began in 1989.

Resettlement of the withdrawn units and combined units is taking place in territories of all the military districts, but primarily into the Kiev, Moscow, Belorussian, Carpathian, North Caucasus, Odessa, and Volga-Ural districts. Now, the housing situation in these districts is very complex.

In 1990, more than 100 million rubles were found for the resettlement of forces arriving from Hungary and Czechoslovakia, and construction is under way for capital housing providing 4,000 apartments, dormitories for more than 11,000 spots, 30 barracks, and 37 various social, cultural, and consumer facilities—schools, six aid stations, 18 dining halls, etc.

The volume of construction for 1991 for withdrawn forces is increasing significantly. There will be 114 military construction detachments drawn into the efforts, and in the future they will be augmented in accordance with the volume of work they are undertaking. A fundamental regrouping of forces and equipment is taking place at present with the goal of resolving this large-scale task. It will be necessary to temporarily halt or suspend the construction of a number of special and combat facilities.

[Ivanyuk] As for the Western Group of Forces, can we count on the help of the Germans in the resolution of the housing problem?

[Chekov] Yes. In conjunction with an agreement between the governments of the USSR and the FRG signed on 9 October 1990, Germany will render assistance in the implementation of a special program of housing construction on the European portion of the USSR which is expected to take place over the next four years. We will be constructing four million square meters of housing. Half of that volume should be built by forces of our military construction organizations using appropriations and material resources from the state budget allotted to the USSR Ministry of Defense.

The FRG has allotted 7.8 billion marks [M] to implement the second half of the program. In this instance it is not only a question of the construction of housing installations, although that is the main thing, but also of the creation of four complete plants for the construction of houses, without which it would be quite difficult to provide the whole program with structures for housing.

[Ivanyuk] Who will be receiving the foreign currency funds allotted by the FRG?

[Chekov] Now more than 40 firms and construction companies from many countries of the world, including the FRG, Italy, France, the United States, Finland, Turkey, Yugoslavia, Spain, Greece, Cyprus, Syria, Poland, Hungary, and Bulgaria, have expressed their readiness to take part in the construction of housing installations and enterprises of the construction industry. Preliminary meetings have already been conducted with the majority of them.

It is also possible that Soviet construction organizations may be enlisted so long as they are able to erect houses or carry out certain types of operations on installations under the same conditions as foreign firms, that is to say using their own material resources, within the established deadlines, and with high quality.

In November, the USSR Ministry of Foreign Economic Ties, with our participation, conducted negotiations with an FRG delegation on the preparation of a protocol concerning procedures for further interaction on the German side in the implementation of an entire program for constructing housing installations and plants for the construction of houses, including the question of inclusion and use of funds allotted by the FRG.

The government of the FRG has authorized the German Restoration Bank [Bank vosstanovleniya] to carry out all the functions with regard to targeted financing of the program within the limits of the allotted M7.8 billion and with regard to control over the course of its implementation, including verification directly at the construction sites.

The prepared draft of the protocol stipulates that an open competition be conducted in the next few months, a so-called "tender," the results of which will select the most reliable and qualified firms able to carry out construction quickly and at the lowest cost.

Signing of the prepared protocol and other contractual documents with the German side is expected during the first half of December, and that will create the legal basis for us to implement the program.

A joint Soviet-German administrative committee has been created for general leadership and control over the course of the program's implementation.

[Ivanyuk] Where will housing be erected for the most part: In major cities or in small garrisons?

[Chekov] As a rule, new microrayons will be created in existing cities, urban communities, and military installations. The advantage of this course is clear: It will be possible to make use of existing communications, energy networks, and roads. As a rule, five-story dwelling houses with the appropriate arrangement of typical one-, two-, and three-room apartments have been adopted for mass construction on the military installations. The foreign firms will be granted the right to choose the construction of the homes and the building and finishing materials. Naturally, the apartments should be equipped in accordance with norms existing in our country.

After a careful study of the localities, 37 housing installations were chosen, each of which should hold no less than 500 apartments, and on the average no less than 1,000. Such an approach is determined primarily by economic savings—it is not expedient to bring in foreign firms to carry out a small volume of work. Kindergartens, schools, outpatient clinics, and other necessary

facilities and engineering networks will also be built at the installations at the same time as the dwelling houses.

[Ivanyuk] Circumstances are difficult in a number of regions at present. Do unforeseen complications not crop up at the local level in conjunction with this?

[Chekov] Of course, execution of the planned program of housing construction is impossible without understanding on the part of the republic and local organs of power. There are several problems with the allotment of plots of land for construction of housing in the Carpathian, Kiev, and Belorussian Military Districts, but I would say they are on the way to being resolved. In any case, the majority of the plots of land for housing construction have already been set aside. Surveying efforts are already being conducted at full speed by forces of military specialists.

Next year foreign firms should begin construction of more than half of the housing installations for the first wave of personnel of the combined units and units arriving from Germany.

The fulfillment of the planned volumes of work by the forces of foreign firms will be a significant aid to the military districts in the resolution of housing problems. For example, in Kiev, Belorussia, Moscow, and Odessa Military Districts, the demand for apartment for those who will arrive from the Western Group of Forces will be 60-70 percent satisfied. It will remain for military construction organizations to construct the remaining dwelling houses in small garrisons or individual buildings in cities and settlements.

Draft on Reforming Political Organs Approved

PM2311133390 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 23 Nov 90 First Edition pl

[Report by Lieutenant Colonel N. Yefimov under the rubric: "Direct Line": "Draft Statute Approved"]

[Text] A scheduled session of the working group set up to implement the USSR Presidential Decree of 3 September this year "On Reforming the Political Organs of the USSR Armed Forces, USSR KGB Troops, USSR Internal Affairs Ministry Internal Troops, and Railroad Troops" has been held at the USSR Defense Ministry.

Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate, delivered a report at the session on the results of work on the draft statute on military-political organs.

A lively, constructive discussion followed the report.

After introducing a number of amendments and clarifications, the members of the working group approved the draft document. It will be submitted for discussion to the USSR Defense Ministry Collegium in the near future.

Moscow Meeting Marks Rocket Forces Day

PM1911154590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 18 Nov 90 First Edition p 1

[Report by KRASNAYA ZVEZDA correspondent: "In Honor of the Holiday"]

[Text] A ceremonial meeting of representatives of the capital's public and soldiers of the Moscow Garrison took place 16 November in Moscow to mark Rocket Forces and Artillery Day.

In the presidium were: O.D. Baklanov, secretary of the CPSU Central Committee; I.S. Belousov, deputy chairman of the USSR Council of Ministers; O.N. Shishkin, USSR minister of general machine building; Army General M.A. Moiseyev, chief of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and USSR first deputy defense minister; Colonel General N.I. Shlyaga, chief of the the Soviet Army and Navy Main Political Directorate; USSR deputy defense ministers; and generals, officers, and veterans.

A report was delivered at the meeting by Army General Yu.P. Maksimov, commander in chief of the Strategic Rocket Forces and USSR deputy defense minister.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Carries Generals' Obituaries**Retired Colonel General**

PM1812153790 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 15 Dec 90 First Edition p 6

[Obituary of Colonel General N.A. Lomov, retired]

[Excerpts] Colonel General Nikolay Andreyevich Lomov, retired, participant in the civil war and the Great Patriotic War, died 11 December 1990 after a serious illness. He devoted his entire conscious life to selflessly serving the motherland and the cause of the Communist Party, which he joined in 1919.

N.A. Lomov was born into a worker's family in the settlement of Kondrovo, Smolensk Oblast, 24 November 1899. [passage omitted]

In the postwar period N.A. Lomov worked in the posts of deputy and chief of the General Staff Main Directorate and deputy chief of the General Staff, and later as chief of staff of Far Eastern troops and chief of staff of the Far Eastern Military District. From 1954 through 1969 N.A. Lomov worked in the Military Academy of the USSR Armed Forces General Staff and made a great contribution to the training of officer cadres. He headed one of the academy's leading departments for more than 10 years. A number of major scientific works on Soviet military strategy were drawn up under his leadership. [passage omitted]

D.T. Yazov, M.A. Moiseyev, P.G. Lushev, K.A. Kochetov, N.I. Shlyaga, Yu.P. Maksimov, V.I. Varennikov, I.M. Tretyak, Ye.I. Shaposhnikov, V.N. Chernavin, V.M. Shuralev, V.M. Arkhipov, V.P. Mironov, N.V. Chekov, V.L. Govorov, V.F. Yermakov, Yu.A. Yashin, M.M. Kozlov, V.G. Denisov, I.A. Larin, I.N. Rodionov, N.V. Goncharov, N.P. Klokotov, F.F. Gayvoronskiy.

Leading DOSAAF Official

PM2111140590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 18 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[Obituary of Lt. Gen. N. Kuznetsov]

[Excerpts] Lieutenant General Dmitriy Nikolayevich Kuznetsov, first deputy chairman of the USSR Voluntary Society for the Promotion of the Army, Aviation, and Navy [DOSAAF] Central Committee and a candidate of historical sciences, who devoted all his conscious life to the socialist Fatherland and the cause of Communist Party of which he had been a member since 1955, has died suddenly in his 59th year. [passage omitted]

[Signed] O.D. Baklanov, V.A. Kuptsov, P.G. Lushev, N.I. Shlyaga, A.S. Pavlov, N.V. Chekov, N.N. Kotlovtshev, A.N. Soshnikov, A.I. Golyakov, G.M. Yegorov, I.N. Kozhedub, V.M. Grishanov, N.N. Dolgin, L.B. Drachevskiy, S.N. Yepifantsev, V.M. Mishin, P.I. Klimuk, V.P. Orlov, V.T. Kanastratov, S.N. Maslov, A.Ya. Shcherbakov, A.I. Anokhin, A.G. Vinnik, A.L. Mamayev, V.P. Morozov, V.I. Kolodin, V.V. Mukhortov, A.S. Khokhlachev

Academy Lecturer

PM2811102590 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA
in Russian 27 Nov 90 First Edition p 4

[Obituary of I.P. Ivanov]

[Excerpts] Lieutenant General (retired) Ivan Petrovich Ivanov, participant in the Great Patriotic War, has died suddenly. He devoted all his conscious life to selfless service of the motherland and the cause of the Communist Party, of which he had been a member since 1943.

I.P. Ivanov was born 14 January 1922 in the settlement of Naziya in Kirovskiy Rayon, Leningrad Oblast. [passage omitted]

Since 1977 he had been senior lecturer at the USSR Armed Forces General Staff Military Academy. [passage omitted]

[Signed] V.I. Varennikov, V.M. Mikhalkin, D.S. Sukhorukov, S.I. Klyapin, I.K. Makarenko, M.D. Sidorov, N.M. Dimidyuk, Yu.I. Shumilikhin, I.G. Kuznetsov, V.G. Kryukov, V.M. Bobrov, V.F. Potekhin, V.F. Petkov.

Feature Honors Posthumous Hero of Soviet Union
PM2011155690

[Editorial Report] Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 17 November 1990 First Edition carries on page 1 under the headline "Citizen. Poet. Soldier," a feature celebrating Afghanistan war hero A.I. Stovba, which begins with the following presidential decree:

"USSR Presidential Decree On Awarding the Title of Hero of the Soviet Union to A.I. Stovba.

"To award Lieutenant Aleksandr Ivanovich Stovba the title of Hero of the Soviet Union (posthumously) for successfully performing tasks in giving international assistance to the Republic of Afghanistan and for the courage and heroism displayed in so doing.

"[Signed] USSR President M. Gorbachev.
"Moscow Kremlin 11 November 1990."

A letter from Defense Minister Yazov reads:

"Letter from the USSR Defense Minister to the Hero's Mother

"Dear Lidiya Petrovna!

"The heroic deed of your son Aleksandr has been recognized by the highest degree of distinction—the title of Hero of the Soviet Union. Sasha's life, which was not long, but was pure and honest—the life of a Citizen, a Poet, and a Soldier—was crowned with this distinction. He was your son, Lidia Petrovna, but he was also the son of the motherland and he served it selflessly to the last. People like Aleksandr live on in the hearts and memories of the people forever, and their example of loyalty to patriotic military duty inspires new generations to glorious deeds and achievements. Lieutenant Aleksandr Stovba is still a part of his beloved regiment and will remain on its roll of honor forever. Our Army always has been and will remain strong and invincible because of fighters like him.

"At this time, which is both bitter and proud for you, his mother, I would like to turn to you, Lidiya Petrovna, with words of greetings, respect, and gratitude. One of Sasha's poems contains the following lines: 'The first word I spoke was simple: Mama. Everything sacred is concealed within it. Mama!' These words bear the key to an understanding of the character of your son and the vital sources that nurtured his deed.

"I bow to the ground before you, and I wish you good health and a long life.

"With deep respect

"[Signed] D. Yazov"

The feature further includes a tribute from B. Gromov under the subhead "We have One Fatherland," praising the behavior of Aleksandr Stovba's family in the face of

his death and outlining his life and his patriotism as an example to other soldiers at a time of nationalistic conflict in the army.

This is followed by a 300-word telephone interview by Major S. Anisko with Aleksandr's mother Lidiya Petrovna Stovba about his death for the motherland and the fact that the motherland honors the memory of its sons.

The feature also includes a 500-word article by Colonel P. Tkachenko entitled "His Poems Became Songs," which speaks of Aleksandr Stovba's literary achievements, and is followed by a few of Aleksandr Stovba's poems.

This is followed by a 1,500-word "Writer's Notes" article in defense of the Army by Colonel Yu. Velichenko, titled "On the Scales of Conscience and Duty," which speaks of the nature of Army service today and public opinion about the Army.

KRASNAYA ZVEZDA Airs Nuclear Test Issues

PM1911093990 Moscow KRASNAYA ZVEZDA in Russian 10 Nov 90 First Edition p 2

[Report by correspondent Lieutenant Colonel O. Falihev: "Novaya Zemlya: Echo of Nuclear Explosion. Our Correspondent Visited the Zone of the Recent Test on the USSR's Northern Range"]

[Text] A squall of emotions and contradictory views literally swept the airwaves and newspaper pages following the 24 October test of a nuclear weapon in the Novaya Zemlya archipelago. The expediency of carrying out new explosions, problems of deputies' being informed of them, and other questions were discussed. As a result, public opinion was electrified in the extreme....

I spent a long time psyching myself up for this meeting, endeavoring to guess in advance what would strike me most strongly in Novaya Zemlya. The polar bears? The mountains of ice and snow? All this was there. Also engraved on my memory are the burning, piercing wind, the almost total ice crust on the land, and the fleeting day, like someone's unexpected glance, amid the polar night. But most of all—the air. The most ordinary air—of astounding purity, it is true—whose taste we in Moscow, alas, forgot long ago. It is amazing, but the fact remains that you can breathe more easily on the nuclear range than in the country's capital.

The sanitary zone where nuclear munitions are detonated is in the north of the archipelago, approximately 250 km from the main military camp at Beluzhaya Guba. But even there, in the settlement of Severnyy, which can only be reached by sea and helicopter, the mountain landscape impresses with its primordial bleakness rather than traces of technological human activity.

The settlement of Severnyy is made up of approximately 20-30 small wooden huts, a boilerhouse, and a mooring. Who lives there permanently? A few military construction workers, some sort of guard, and a tunneling team from the Ukraine which digs galleries. This work is roughly the same as for subway builders. At the base of the mountain a gallery going two or three km into it is dug. There, deep within the rock, a nuclear device is set up, with dozens of wires leading from it to the command center to record telemetric information. In several places the exit is "sealed" by concrete, metal, and other barriers to prevent radioactive gases and decay products from reaching the outside after an explosion. This, in fact, is the entire technology.

Together with a group of officers and nuclear specialists I went up to the foot of the mountain within whose belly the nuclear explosion recently occurred. Beside me were Rear Admiral V. Gorev, chief of the range, and Candidate of Technical Sciences Colonel V. Safronov, chief of the radiation research group. The snowy slope was bare and deserted. One km away from it we took readings with a roentgenometer. The sensitive instrument showed eight-10 microroentgen per hour. We detected no so-called "dirt"—beta-particles. The next reading was 30 meters from the entrance to the gallery. The scale showed 20 microroentgen. Is that a lot or a little? For comparison, I will remind you that the average level of background radiation in Moscow is approximately 15-20 microroentgen. Judge for yourselves.

We went on, into the sanitary zone surrounded by barbed wire and signs warning of the radiation danger. We approached the very mouth of the gallery, which had been carefully closed against chance entry by people or animals. It was only here, in the "subway" lobby, figuratively speaking, that the instruments showed an increased level of radiation, but still within permissible limits.

"Can you guarantee the reliability of the measuring equipment?" I asked Col. Safronov. "And do you inform the public of the results of readings?"

"I responsibly declare," Safronov said, "that Soviet specialists ensure that nuclear explosions are monitored to a standard not inferior to U.S. standards. Certain models of diagnostic equipment are simply unique to us: The Americans have offered big money for them. As for informing the public, there is the Public Information Center under the USSR Ministry of Atomic Power Engineering and Industry, to which measurement data and biological samples are sent. Similar materials are sent to the Arkhangelsk Nature Conservation Committee."

I will add that expeditions from the USSR Ministry of Health, the USSR State Committee for Hydrometeorology, and the USSR Ministry of the Fish Industry have visited the range at various times. They confirmed that underground explosions have resulted in no change in the radiation and ecological situation at the range or

outside it. There is no subterranean water in Novaya Zemlya, and the nearest population center is almost 300 km away. Finally, the permafrost contributes to the self-localization of cracks and breaks in the ground, preserving, as it were, for ages the products of nuclear decay.

Why am I saying all this? Is it not in order to lull public opinion? I believe that nuclear tests are an evil which sooner or later mankind must end. When and how is another matter. Before expressing my own viewpoint on this question, I will return to figures. I have before me an act signed by representatives of the public in the Komi ASSR [Autonomous Soviet Socialist Republic] and Arkhangelsk Oblast. In particular, by I. Shpektor, people's deputy of the Komi ASSR and of Vorkuta City Soviet and member of the republic Supreme Soviet Standing Commission on Ecology; A. Taskayev, director of the Komi ASSR Biology Institute; M. Danilov, aide to RSFSR [Russian Soviet Federated Socialist Republic] People's Deputy A. Butorin; and correspondents for a number of local press publications. It speaks of measurements near the installation where the underground nuclear explosion was carried out 24 October 1990. I cite: "Some 30 meters from the gallery the gamma background did not exceed 20 microroentgen per hour, and there was no beta contamination. In the settlements of Rogachevo, Beluzhya, and Severnyy and on the transport ships Yauza and Gradus the gamma background stood at between seven and 15 microroentgen per hour, and there was no beta contamination." As we see, these figures are not very different from those obtained by our group. "I took my own dosimeter with me," Igor Leonidovich Shpektor said in conversation with me. "We used it to take readings from Vorkuta to Amderma. The background everywhere was lower than in Vorkuta and Moscow. The range is clean ecologically and so has a right to live. As for bald deer, those are fabrications."

Yet, maybe those who suggest that we should unilaterally end nuclear tests are right? But it is important to remember here that the United States is now working on the creation [sozdaniye] of third-generation nuclear weapons and has approved a 20-year program to improve them at a cost of \$81 billion. And yet peace, as is known, rests on parity between the Soviet and U.S. nuclear arsenals. If this is upset, strategic equilibrium will collapse, we will become more vulnerable, and, in the final analysis, we will lag behind forever in ensuring our own adequate security.

But maybe it will be economically advantageous to end tests in our difficult times? We spend several tens of millions of rubles a year on all testing of nuclear weapons. Most of it goes on the Semipalatinsk range, which is evidently coming to the end of its life, while less goes on the Novaya Zemlya one. If it were distributed among Muscovites, let us say, everyone would end up with just over one ruble.... Whereas "Nevada" costs \$600-700 million a year. France, Britain, and China have not stopped testing.

Proceeding from the doctrine of defense sufficiency, the Soviet Union has advocated and continues to advocate a complete end to all nuclear testing. We have more than once announced moratoriums on explosions and have observed them. Before this explosion, for example, our ranges had been silent for 12 months. But the appeal was not heard. The U.S. Congress, to which the USSR Supreme Soviet put a further proposal to conclude a moratorium last year, is also silent. As far as can be judged, the United States generally takes a calmer attitude to this problem, perceiving it as a "necessary evil." For example, millionaires gather in Las Vegas, that world-renowned gaming house situated some 100 km from "Nevada," and do not complain of any radiation. And not because they are not concerned about their health. They know the radiation levels. "Although some of our deputies, activists in the 'Nevada-Semipalatinsk' movement, act out of good intentions and sincerely, still they do so without knowing the real state of affairs," Rear Adm. V. Vyskrebentsev, chairman of the state commission for the last experiment, expressed his opinion. It is evidently impossible to disagree with him.

It is another matter that we have to resolve many organizational questions connected with regulating the tests and creating a legislative base them. For the time being certain questions here are being resolved by departmental acts—ordinances, in other words. Why, for example, was a mistake made when informing deputies of the time of the explosion? Because this is not yet clearly defined in documents. Although no test of a nuclear weapon is conducted without a decision by the government and the Defense Council. As for the time frame, it depends on the condition of the diagnostic equipment, weather conditions, and the technical preparedness of the experiment. As we see, it is extremely difficult to set the timing accurately in advance.

"I was informed of the timing of this explosion literally 2.5 hours in advance," V. Mikhaylov, USSR deputy minister of atomic power engineering and industry, said. "It is virtually impossible to calculate everything in advance down to the minute."

In fact, do we need to know the specific timing? What would it give us? In the United States, for example, the program for conducting tests states a great deal apart from their precise timing, once again for understandable reasons. We, too, have drawn up a program to modernize the country's nuclear weapons complex. It was approved in the Defense Council, ratified by the president, and recommended to the government for concrete realization. So maybe it is necessary to make public this program? Let people know how much it costs and how many explosions will follow in a year. Those who carry them out will determine their specific timing. I believe that such reasonable openness would remove many questions and do away with confrontation with public movements.

Or take this question. In Nevada there are state services to monitor radiation safety. But neighboring Las Vegas has its own laboratory which monitors in the interests of the state. Is it really not possible to think of creating something similar in Amderma or Arkhangelsk? Not everyone knows that the range has a statute approved in 1956 and kept at Arkhangelsk Oblast Soviet Executive Committee. It prescribes who must report what to whom. But it has evidently become obsolete in some respects. Who is preventing it from being brought into line with the present day? Finally, all of us, including our people's elected representatives, must learn civilized disagreement. So that we can argue and ascertain the truth like civilized people and not, say, throw ourselves under tanks in squares or incite the crew of a foreign ship, not even Greenpeace, to break the laws of our own country.

Speaking of Greenpeace, Rear Adm. Gorev said that the range's servicemen displayed tact toward its representatives who landed on our shore. They were taken to a hotel and given food. "Why do you not go on an inspection to China?" one of the officers asked them. "It is dangerous there," an Irish girl replied. At a recent news conference in Moscow USSR Deputy Foreign Minister V. Karpov said that the ambassadors of Nordic countries had treated with understanding the test which we conducted.

As for the professionals, the military, I believe that they must continue worthily fulfilling their duty. The country has entrusted its security to them, charging them with keeping formidable weapons at the ready. Were something to happen, they would have to answer in a most responsible manner.

Military Officials Uphold Yugoslav Proposal

LD2111161790 Belgrade TANJUG in English
1304 GMT 21 Nov 90

[Text] Moscow, November 21 (TANJUG)—Soviet military circles today upheld the Yugoslav proposal for an international conference to be held in 1992 to discuss the transformation of the military industry into an industrial branch whose output would meet peace-time needs.

The proposal was one of the central topics of the three-day talks, which ended here today, between representatives of the Belgrade Institute for Strategic Research and Soviet officials.

Yugoslav experts, academician Rajko Tomovic and Dusan Strujic, as guests of the Soviet Foreign Ministry Centre for Coordination of Scientific Activities, discussed the transformation of the military industry with members of the Soviet planning committee, legislature, and defense and state security committee.

In view of the intensified disarmament and troops reductions, a shift to the production of non-military articles is being given prominence in Soviet state programmes.